

COMPANION  
TO THE  
REVISED VERSION  
OF THE  
ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT  
BY ALEXANDER ROBERTS D.D.,  
WITH EXPLANATIONS  
OF THE APPENDIX,  
*By a Member of the American Committee.*

From the Library of  
Professor Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield  
Bequeathed by him to  
the Library of  
Princeton Theological Seminary









*P. R. W.*  
*June 1881*

# COMPANION

TO THE

# REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

EXPLAINING THE REASONS FOR THE CHANGES MADE  
ON THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

✓ BY

ALEX. ROBERTS, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY, ST. ANDREW'S, AND MEMBER OF THE ENGLISH  
NEW TESTAMENT COMPANY.

*47* ✓ *22 June 1881*  
*WITH SUPPLEMENT,*

BY

A MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF REVISION.

*47* ✓ *22 June 1881*  

---

*AUTHORIZED EDITION.*

---

NEW YORK:

I. K. FUNK & CO.,  
10 AND 12 DEY STREET.

COPYRIGHT,  
1881,  
BY I. K. FUNK & CO. AND O. M. DUNHAM.

---

PRESS OF J. J. LITTLE & CO.,  
NO. 10 TO 20 ASTOR PLACE, NEW YORK.

# CONTENTS.



## PART I.

### CHANGES ARISING FROM AN AMENDED TEXT.

| CHAP. |                                                                                             | PAGE |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I.    | Various Readings in the New Testament.....                                                  | I    |
| II.   | Sources of Various Readings in the New Testament.....                                       | 16   |
| III.  | History and Character of the Greek Text on which the<br>Authorised Version was founded..... | 34   |
| IV.   | Examples of Minor Changes caused by a Change of<br>Text.....                                | 46   |
| V.    | More Important Changes due to a Change of Text.....                                         | 60   |

## PART II.

### CHANGES ARISING FROM AN AMENDED TRANSLATION.

|      |                                                                                                            |     |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| I.   | Correction of Mistakes in the Meaning of Greek Words                                                       | 75  |
| II.  | Correction of Mistakes in Greek Grammar.....                                                               | 89  |
| III. | Correction of Archaisms, Ambiguities, and the Rendering<br>of Proper Names and Technical Expressions ..... | 105 |
| IV.  | Correction of the Unnecessary Confounding of one<br>Greek Word with another in Translation .....           | 118 |
| V.   | Correction of Needless Variations in the Translation of<br>the same Greek words.....                       | 135 |

## PART III.

## THE ANGLO-AMERICAN REVISION.

*By an American Reviser.*

|                                                          | PAGE |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------|
| I. The English Version of 1611.....                      | 154  |
| II. The Canterbury Revision of 1870.....                 | 162  |
| III. American Co-operation.....                          | 165  |
| IV. Constitution of the American Committee .....         | 168  |
| V. Relation of the American and English Committees. .... | 170  |
| VI. The American Part in the Joint Work.....             | 175  |
| VII. Some American Suggestions adopted.....              | 181  |
| VIII. The Points of Agreement.....                       | 188  |
| IX. The American Appendix .....                          | 192  |
| X. Points of Variation .....                             | 194  |
| <br>1. <i>Titles and Headings of Books</i> .....         | 194  |
| 2. <i>Archaic Forms</i> .....                            | 196  |
| 3. <i>Rendering of Terms denoting Coins</i> .....        | 199  |
| 4. <i>More Accurate Renderings</i> .....                 | 202  |
| <br>CONCLUSION .....                                     | 204  |
| INDEX OF TEXTS.....                                      | 207  |

## PREFACE.

---

THE object of this little work is to explain to the English reader the general grounds of those many departures from the Authorised Version which he will find in the Revised translation. Not one of these alterations has been made without what appeared to a majority of the Revisers an adequate reason. They are all to be traced to one or other of two causes—either to a change of the Greek text which it was found necessary to adopt, or to a change of translation which stricter fidelity to the original seemed to require. Under these two heads, all necessary explanations (so far as space permitted), will be found in the following pages.

For the sake of those who are acquainted with the original, the Greek words referred to have been sometimes given at the bottom of the page, but the text will be perfectly intelligible without these to the English reader.

It is scarcely needful to add that for what is here written the author alone is responsible.

*St. Andrews.*

## PREFACE TO THE AMERICAN EDITION.

---

DR. ROBERTS, a member of the English Committee of Revision, has prepared a "Companion to the Revised Version of the English New Testament." This is an instructive and useful explanation of the departures from the Authorized Version, but is silent about the American Appendix and the relation of the American Committee to the whole work. It is therefore desirable to supply this defect by such additional information as can be published, without a breach of confidence, in the interest of both Committees, which have so far harmoniously and successfully completed their joint task.

The writer has been urged to prepare this pamphlet by a number of friends and fellow-revisers, but is alone responsible for the opinions expressed, and disclaims any official authority. The New Testament Company has adjourned *sine die*, and is not likely to convene again unless a special emergency should call them together. An official history of the whole movement cannot be issued until the Revision of the Old Testament is completed.

NEW YORK, May, 1881.

P A R T   I.

---

CHANGES ARISING FROM AN  
AMENDED TEXT.



# COMPANION

TO THE

*Revised Version of the English New Testament.*



## CHAPTER I.

### VARIOUS READINGS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE number of various readings in the New Testament has been differently estimated at different times. Nor could this have been otherwise. Every new manuscript which is discovered increases the amount, and every more accurate examination of already known manuscripts tends to the same result. Hence, while the varieties of reading in the New Testament were reckoned at about 30,000 in the last century, they are generally referred to as amounting to no less than 150,000 at the present day.

This is a statement which is apt at first to be felt alarming by those unacquainted with the science of Biblical criticism. They are naturally disposed to ask—When so many differences of reading exist, must not the sacred text be very uncertain? But,

happily, this is a question which can be very easily and satisfactorily answered.

For, in the first place, the vast majority of the various readings are of no practical importance. Multitudes of them are mere errors in spelling into which the writer has fallen, either from his ear having deceived him if he wrote from dictation, or his eye having mistaken one letter for another in the manuscript which lay before him. Others consist of the substitution of one synonymous word for another, or of a mere change of order without any appreciable distinction of sense. As in English the meaning is the same, whether we say, "He went forth," or "He went out," "Let us go on," or "Let us proceed," "The enemy escaped," or "The enemy made their escape," so is it very frequently in the Greek. And, just as it makes no difference in our language, whether we say "Paul the Apostle," or "The Apostle Paul," "The poet Milton," or "Milton the poet," so too is it with a large number of those variations which occur in the text of the New Testament.

But, in the second place, so far from the immense variety of readings which have been collected giving rise to uncertainty, the very fact that we possess these constitutes our best hope of being able to approach to certainty with respect to the original text. This may appear a paradoxical statement, but it admits of

easy demonstration. For, let us refer to any of those ancient writings, in the printed text of which there exist no various readings. Are such texts trustworthy and pure? Nay, the very opposite is the case; they are all hopelessly corrupt, and the reason is evident. There are no varieties of reading, simply because these works have come down to us in a single manuscript only. That manuscript is the sole authority to which appeal can be made as to their text. And, of course, if every printed edition is taken from that, without conjecture venturing to make any changes, all the copies will be exactly alike. But nothing could be more calamitous to an ancient author than such a circumstance. His work having been transcribed so often, in the course of many centuries, has, of necessity, become disfigured with numerous errors. And, as it survives in only one manuscript, there is no possibility of comparison, and no means of correction, except by the arbitrary process of conjecture, which will always vary with different minds. The consequence is, that all sorts of guesses are made by editors as to the true text of these unfortunate writings. While there are, for the reason stated, no various readings, there is the utmost variety of conjectures. Every one feels that the existing text is in multitudes of passages corrupt, and from want of documentary evidence has

no resource but to proceed to correct it just as his caprice or judgment may suggest.

How different does the case stand in regard to the New Testament! No miracle has been wrought to preserve its text as it came from the pens of the inspired writers. That would have been a thing altogether out of harmony with God's method of governing the world. The manuscripts containing a record of the divine will have been left, like others, to suffer from those causes of error which will presently be mentioned. But a gracious providence has, nevertheless, been exerted in connection with the text of the New Testament. It has been so ordered that vastly more copies of the sacred volume have come down to us in manuscript than of any other ancient writing. We learn from the best authorities on the subject that no fewer than 1,760 manuscripts of the New Testament, in whole or in parts, are known to scholars in our day.\* The most important of these will be afterwards described. But it is enough at present simply to note the existence of such a wealth of material, in order to feel how abundant is the means with which it has pleased God to furnish us for ascertaining, through careful examination and comparison, the true text of the New Testament.

\* Scrivener's *Introduction*, 2nd ed., p. 269.

We may now proceed to a consideration of the causes which have given rise to the vast variety of readings that has been mentioned. These causes may perhaps all be embraced under one or other of the following heads.

First, there are those differences of reading which have sprung *from pure mistake*.

As universal experience has proved, nothing is more difficult than to get any large amount of mere copying work done with absolute correctness. The transcriber may be careless or incompetent, and then, of course, his work will be badly done. No doubt this has given rise to not a few of the mistakes which appear in manuscripts of the New Testament. Some of the copyists knew very little of what they were doing, while others disliked the drudgery; and so, from ignorance or weariness, they fell into error. But even the most skilful and patient of them might easily go astray in the work of transcription. One word might be mistaken for another. This is often found even in printed books at the present day. It is needless to quote examples, as all are familiar with them.\* But much more liable to this kind of error were

\* A long list of mistakes which have occurred in the printing of some editions of the Scriptures is given by Dr. Eadie—*The English Bible*, II. 318. Among them are such as these—“enticed in everything,” for “enriched in everything” “leadteth them not,” for “leadteth them out;” “eject,” for “elect,” &c.

transcribers than printers. We find, accordingly, numerous examples of various readings due to such mistakes. It is, for instance, owing to this that we read in the Authorised English Version, at 1 Tim. i. 4, these words, “rather than *godly edifying* which is in faith,” instead of “rather than a *dispensation* of God which is in faith,” as in the Revised Version. There is in Greek only the difference of a single letter between the word meaning “edification,” and the word meaning “dispensation,”\* so that copyists readily mistook the one for the other. Sometimes a mistake of this kind has taken place without any effect upon the sense, as at Mark v. 14, where the change made in the Greek text† has led to no change in the Revised Version.

Again, transcribers were frequently betrayed into error by those words of *like ending* which occurred in the manuscripts. An illustration in English may be found at Matt. v. 8, 9. Both these verses end with the word “God,” and it is easy to imagine that the eye of a copyist might light on that word at the end of verse 9 instead of verse 8, and thus, after transcribing the one verse, be led to omit the next following. This has been a very fruitful cause of omission in even the best Greek manuscripts. Thus,

\* The two Greek words are *οἰκυδομίαν* and *οἰκονομίαν*.

† ἀπήγγεαν is now read instead of ἀνήγγειλαν.

in perhaps the very oldest copy of the New Testament which we possess—Codex B, to be afterwards described—we find that the whole of the verse, Matt. xii. 47, has been left out. And the reason is quite obvious. Both verse 46 and verse 47 end with the same Greek word.\* The copyist looking up at his exemplar, after having written verse 46, had his eye attracted by the word at the end of verse 47, and, fancying that he had just transcribed that verse, was led to pass it over altogether. There can be no question that this is the reason why the second clause in 1 John ii. 23, is omitted in several manuscripts, so as to stand marked in the Authorised Version of doubtful authority. The three last words of both the first and second clauses are exactly the same in Greek; and hence the second clause had been overlooked by some transcribers. There is now no hesitation among Biblical scholars as to the genuineness of the clause; and it consequently stands unchallenged—a weighty doctrinal utterance—in the Revised Version.

Further, mere glosses, doxologies, or liturgical formularies, written on the margin of manuscripts, were sometimes inadvertently introduced by transcribers into the text. Thus, an unwarranted *explanation* has been admitted at John v. 3, 4; the

\* Both verses end with λαλῆσαι.

omission of which in the Revised Version, on good grounds of evidence, relieves the passage of an obvious difficulty. The *doxology* of the Lord's prayer, Matt. vi. 13, which seems to have been quite unknown to the early Fathers of the Church, probably crept into the text from the margin in like manner. And there can hardly be a doubt that the *ecclesiastical formula*, Acts viii. 37, found in many manuscripts, but certainly not genuine, owed its place to a similar mistake. Nothing could be more natural than that additions from the margin—explanatory, doxological, or rubrical—should occasionally find their way into the body of some of the manuscripts, while yet the mass of authorities remained uncorrupted, and still enable us at the present day to discover for ourselves the original text.

Once more, under this head, error would sometimes arise from the unconscious working of the mind of the copyist on the passage before him. Few transcribers could act the part of mere machines. Their minds accompanied their pens: they *thought* about what they were doing; and this sometimes proved fatal to the perfect accuracy of their work. Supplementary expressions, due to the exercise of their own mental powers, slipped in without their perceiving it. Thus at Matt. xviii. 28, the true reading is simply, “Pay what thou owest,” but it was most natural for a

copyist to insert a pronoun, so as to read as in the text represented by the Authorised Version, "Pay me what thou owest." Thus, again, the reading of the Revised Version at Luke xxiv. 53 is, "were continually in the temple, blessing God," but in not a few manuscripts we find, "praising and blessing God." There is no reason, in such cases, to imagine that the variation arose from design on the part of the transcribers. They were men and not machines, and sometimes, all unconsciously, left the impress of their own thoughts upon their work. Judging by constant experience, nothing is more certain than that unintended supplements would, in this way, be made to the text; and, unless he were constantly on the watch, there was even all the more risk that a transcriber would thus be led to deviate from correctness the farther he rose above a mere piece of mechanism, and executed his work with interest and intelligence.

Hitherto we have been dealing with errors due to pure accident—errors with which the will of the copyists had nothing to do, and from which, we may believe, they would have gladly kept free if they could. But we have now to notice—

Secondly, those differences of reading which have arisen *from intention on the part of the transcribers.*

Unusual expressions were altered. A transcriber meeting with an uncommon word or an ungrammati-

cal construction, was strongly tempted to change that into a form with which he was familiar. It might naturally enough occur to him that, in such a case, his predecessor in the work of copying had made a mistake, and that he ought to remove the blemish thus introduced into the sacred text. This tendency to correction has been a very fruitful source of various readings. It operated in many ways. For instance, seeming harshnesses were smoothed. Thus, at Matt. xxv. 3, we read in the Revised Version, “For the foolish, when they took their lamps, took no oil with them.” But the initial “for” in the Greek, not being liked or understood, was exchanged for the reading represented in the Authorised Version. Again, rare forms of words were rejected in favour of the more usual. An example occurs at Rom. xiv. 4, without having any effect upon the sense.\* Grammatical corrections, too, were made, as at Matt. xiii. 16, Rev. iv. 1,† and in many other places. Moreover, changes were sometimes introduced, in order to remove real or apparent difficulties. Thus, at Mark i. 2 the true reading is given in the Revised Version—“As it is written in Isaiah the prophet.” But, inasmuch as the quotation which follows is not wholly from Isaiah, but

\*  $\delta\mu\nu\alpha\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}$  is now read instead of  $\delta\mu\nu\alpha\tau\delta s\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\iota\iota$ .

†  $\grave{\alpha}ko\nu\epsilon\iota$  has been substituted for the true reading  $\grave{\alpha}ko\nu\o\sigma\iota\iota\iota$ , and  $\lambda\acute{e}\gamma\o\nu\sigma\alpha$  for  $\lambda\acute{e}\gamma\omega\sigma\alpha$ .

partly also from Malachi, the words of the Evangelist were corrected into “As it is written in the prophets.” And yet again, additions to the text seem at times to have been made with the mistaken view of promoting edification. Thus, at 1 Cor. vi. 20, the Revised Version simply reads, “Glorify God, therefore, in your body;” but in some manuscripts we find the addition represented by these words in English—“and in your spirit, which are God’s.” However excellent the motive which may have prompted the appending of these words, they are wholly out of place, and only serve to blunt the point of the Apostle’s exhortation. This must be plain to every one who considers the context. The same thing appears in several other passages, and very markedly at Rom. viii. 1, where the insertion of the second clause does away with the grand simplicity of the conclusion stated by St. Paul, when he announces as the result of all his previous reasonings—“There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.”

In view of what has just been said, Biblical critics have adopted two great principles as guides to a decision with respect to the true text of Scripture. The first is, that a difficult or obscure expression, nay, even an almost unintelligible term, or a wholly ungrammatical construction, is generally to be regarded as the genuine reading, in preference to another which

is easy, familiar, and correct. The reason is clear, since a transcriber was far more likely to change what he did not like or understand into something which he thought better, than to substitute for a common word or a correct construction that which was unusual or irregular. The other general principle is, for the most part to prefer a shorter to a longer reading. As we have seen above, additions were apt in various ways to steal into the text, so that, where there are conflicting readings, the briefer form has, probably, the stronger claim to be accepted. Of course, however, these principles cannot be carried out in every case, or in any hard, mechanical way, but must always be applied in subordination to a cautious and discriminating judgment.

Next, a widely operative cause of various readings has been the practice of conforming one parallel passage to another. As was to be expected, from the amount of common matter which they present, this is found most frequently in the Gospels. In fact, the tendency might be largely illustrated from almost every chapter of the first three Evangelists. But the following examples will suffice. The true reading at Mark i. 11 is, "Thou art my beloved Son, in *thee* I am well pleased;" but this has been so far conformed to the text of Matt. iii. 17, as to stand, "in *whom* I am well pleased." Again, the true reading at Matt.

xvii. 4 is, “If thou wilt, *I* will make here three tabernacles ;” but it has been brought into harmony with Mark ix. v., and Luke ix. 33, so as to become, “Let *us* make.” Once more, the true reading at Luke viii. 34 is, “And when they that fed them saw what had come to pass, they fled, and told it,” &c. ; but two words have been inserted in the Greek, that it might be the same as in Matt. viii. 33—“they fled, *and went* and told,” &c. Now, as was most natural—and, indeed, without a constant miracle, inevitable—the Synoptics,\* with all the wonderful verbal agreement which they exhibit, also differ occasionally in the reports which they give of the words of Christ and others. And it is most important that the characteristic readings of their respective texts should in every place be restored. This will be evident when it is considered that these minute differences clearly prove that the Evangelists did not copy from each other, as has often been maintained, but were original writers, and therefore independent witnesses to the Gospel history. In the Epistles the same tendency on the part of transcribers to secure a verbal harmony between parallel or similar passages may also to some extent be detected. Thus we find Col. i. 14 conformed to Eph. i. 7, so as to stand, “In whom we

\* By this convenient expression is meant the first three Evangelists as distinguished from the fourth.

have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," while the true reading is, "In whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins." Many other examples of correction for the sake of uniformity might be quoted from these Epistles. This was, no doubt, deemed a gain by the copyists. But it was, on the contrary, a loss ; for every Biblical student at the present day will acknowledge that, though the two Epistles are strikingly coincident both in thought and expression, a real interest attaches to the distinctive forms by which they are respectively distinguished.

Lastly, some various readings have probably been due to doctrinal bias on the part of transcribers. Considering the many and violent controversies which have agitated the Church in the course of her history, this could scarcely fail to be the case. A doctrine will often hinge upon a single word. Whether, for example, Christ is spoken of as *God* at Acts xx. 28, seems to involve the chief point at issue between the Orthodox and the Arians or Socinians. A strong temptation was thus presented to copyists to tamper with the text according to their own predilections. But upon the whole this temptation was very successfully resisted. We have every reason to believe that the ancient transcribers in general performed their solemn task with the utmost fidelity. It is pretty clear, indeed, that the substitution of

“Joseph” for “His father,” at Luke ii. 33, and again of “Joseph and Mary,” for “His parents,” at verse 41 of the same chapter, was made in the presumed interests of a very vital doctrine, that of the miraculous conception. And it might seem that the insertion in the text of 1 John v. 7, 8, was plainly due to a desire to uphold the doctrine of the Trinity. Yet this famous passage may, after all, have been at first a mere marginal gloss, which was, at length, admitted to the text through inadvertence. We are unwilling to charge wilful perversion upon those men to whom we are indebted for the many manuscripts of the New Testament which have reached our day. Readers of the Revised Version will be able to judge for themselves how many or few of such alternative readings as have been placed on the margin can be ascribed to prejudice or unfaithfulness. For myself, I believe that these are exceedingly rare.

And now having had before us the amount, the nature, and the causes of the various readings,\* we proceed in the next chapter to consider their *sources*, as found in manuscripts, ancient versions, and Patristic quotations, of the New Testament.

\* Additional illustrations of the causes of various readings treated of in this chapter will be found in Chapters iv. and v. of this Part.

## CHAPTER II.

### SOURCES OF VARIOUS READINGS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE most immediate and important source of various readings, in other words, of the materials for comparative criticism, is, of course, that found in still-existing manuscripts of the New Testament. As has been already suggested, a very great number of these are available for the settlement of the sacred text at the present day. There is a striking contrast in this respect between the New Testament and other ancient writings. While we have no manuscript of Sophocles and other classical authors that can be dated higher than the tenth century of our era, there are, in our possession, as will immediately be shown, manuscripts of the New Testament dating from the fourth and fifth centuries. And, while, in the case of the Greek and Latin classics we sometimes feel reduced to only one manuscript as the fountain-head from which all the others have been derived, we have, in the case of the New Testament, multitudes of independent copies, which enable us, with far greater certainty than can

be felt in regard to other ancient writings, to determine the original text.

The manuscripts of the New Testament are divided into two classes, according to the manner in which they are written. For many centuries after the Christian era capital letters were employed throughout, hardly any distinction being made at the beginning of sentences, and no space being left between the words. The following verse in English characters will give the reader some idea of the appearance presented by these ancient manuscripts.

THEBOOKOFTHEGENERATIONOFJESUS  
CHRISTTHESONOFDAVIDTHESONOFABRA  
HAM. Matt. i. 1.

Manuscripts thus written have been styled *Uncials*, while the others, written more in the form common among ourselves, are called *Cursives*. The line between the two modes of writing may be drawn somewhere about the tenth century. When we rise beyond that date few indeed are the manuscripts to which we can appeal for the materials of criticism. Besides some very precious fragments, there are only five copies of the New Testament at all complete which can be referred to a higher antiquity. These are to be dated, as we shall see, between the fourth and the sixth century.

Biblical scholars have adopted the practice of designating the ancient manuscripts of the New Testament by the letters of the alphabet. This is a concise and convenient mode of referring to them, and has been generally accepted throughout the Christian world. It is only to be regretted that the several letters have not been assigned to the manuscripts on any fixed principle, but simply as, in the progress of textual criticism, they happened to be applied. Neither the value nor antiquity of the Codices is indicated by the letters naming them, or by the order in which they thus, naturally, fall to be described.

A, or the *Alexandrian Manuscript*. This is a very complete copy of the Greek Scriptures. It is bound in four volumes, of which the first three contain the Septuagint Version, and the fourth the New Testament. The only passages in which this manuscript is defective are St. Matthew's Gospel up to chap. xxv. 6, beginning with the Greek word which corresponds to the English "Go ye out;" St. John's Gospel, from "that a man," chap. vi. 50, to "thou sayest," chap. viii. 52; and I Corinthians, from "I believe," chap. iv. 13, to "of me," chap. xii. 6. The Book of Revelation, so apt to suffer in the manuscripts, has, happily, been preserved entire in the Alexandrian Codex, from the circumstance of its being followed by the Epistles of the Roman Clement. This was

the first really valuable manuscript made use of for the purposes of criticism, and has been published in *fac-simile*. It was brought to this country in 1628, having been sent in that year by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, as a present to Charles I. It is preserved in the British Museum.

Scholars are now agreed that the Alexandrian manuscript is to be dated in the fifth century. Many have thought that its birthplace was Egypt, but the reasons assigned for this are not conclusive. It need not be doubted, however, that it was, at one time, at Alexandria, whence it has derived its name. Cyril was patriarch of that city before being transferred to Constantinople, and probably took the manuscript with him on his removal. We shall afterwards have occasion to notice the testimony of this Codex with respect to the famous passage 1 Tim. iii. 16.

B, or *the Vatican manuscript*. This is a most interesting and precious manuscript. Its external history cannot be traced further back than the year 1475, when it appears in the first published catalogue of the Vatican Library. For a long time this manuscript, notwithstanding its known value, was but little used for the criticism of Scripture. In fact, it was not accessible to scholars. Many efforts were, from time to time, made to have it fully collated, but in vain. The history of these attempts has imparted a romantic

but somewhat painful interest to the manuscript. Like many other treasures of art and literature, it was removed from Rome to Paris by the first Napoleon. But no fully competent critic had then an opportunity of examining it ; and on being restored to the Papal authorities it was very jealously guarded. At last Cardinal Mai prepared an edition of it, and this was issued in 1859. But it was found to have been constructed on the most uncritical principles, and consequently to be full of errors. Biblical critics were thus still left in doubt as to the true reading of this manuscript in many passages. This continued till the year 1868, when the New Testament text of the Codex was published in *fac-simile* by two eminent scholars, under the auspices of Pio Nono. This splendid edition was executed with the greatest care, and seems to leave little more to be desired in connection with the queen of all the manuscripts of the New Testament.

There is no hesitation among scholars in dating the Vatican manuscript at least as high as the fourth century. Some think that it may even lay claim to a still higher antiquity. The late eminent paleographer, Dr. Tregelles, remarks :—“How much older this manuscript may be than the middle of the fourth century we have no means of determining.”\* It is certain that the letters in which it is written bear a striking resemblance

\* *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 161.

to those in some of the Greek rolls found at Herculaneum. And all the other features which it presents testify to its great age. Unfortunately, it now wants the Epistle to the Hebrews from chap. ix. 14, all the Pastoral Epistles, and the Book of Revelation. The witness which it bears to the true text in some interesting and important passages will be adverted to in a subsequent chapter.

C, or the *Ephraem manuscript*. This is what is called a *palimpsest*, that is a manuscript in which two different works are found, the one having been written over the other. The practice originated in the scarcity and dearness of parchment during the middle ages. And valuable works were, in this way, often sacrificed to others which were comparatively worthless. It need hardly be said how ignorant were the copyists of those times. Most of the clergy, even, knew scarcely anything about the Scriptures. According to George Buchanan, it was usual for the priests of his day to affirm that Luther had been the author of a book called the New Testament!\* When we take this profound ignorance into account, we are less surprised than we might otherwise be at finding that the sacred text itself was sometimes buried beneath a different work. In the case of the Ephraem Codex, it was some of the Greek writings of the Syrian divine

\* Eadie's *English Bible*, ii. 311.

Ephraem, which had been preferred to the New Testament, and hence the name given to the manuscript. It was not for a considerable period that the sacred text was discovered, and only in 1834 was it rendered generally legible by the application of a chemical tincture. The manuscript was soon afterwards published.

It is believed that this manuscript is to be dated at least as early in the fifth century as the Alexandrian manuscript. Little is known of its history beyond the fact that it once belonged to a nephew of Leo X. It is now preserved in the National Library at Paris. So far as it has survived it is a very valuable copy of the New Testament. But gaps frequently occur in it, and two whole epistles, second Thessalonians and second John, have been altogether lost.

D, or *the manuscript of Beza*. This manuscript once belonged to the eminent reformer Beza, and hence its name. It was presented by him in the year 1581 to the University of Cambridge, and on that account is sometimes referred to as the Cambridge manuscript. Beza tells us that he found it in 1562 lying neglected in the monastery of St. Irenæus at Lyons. This manuscript seems to have been slightly used by Stephens in the preparation of his third edition, which came out in 1550. Nothing whatever is known of its previous history.

The Codex of Beza is generally referred by critics to the sixth century. It contains only the Gospels and Acts in Greek and Latin, with a few verses in Latin (v. 11—15), from the Third Epistle of John. Many strange interpolations and manifest corruptions occur in it, but it is nevertheless of great value. The University published a *fac-simile* edition of it in 1793; and a very scholarly edition was issued in common type in 1864. This manuscript is remarkable as being the oldest which contains the section John vii. 53—viii. 11., a passage to be afterwards considered.

\* or *the Sinaitic manuscript*. The late Professor Tischendorf discovered this manuscript in the most singular manner. Being in 1844 at the convent of St. Catharine on Mount Sinai, his attention was one day caught by some leaves of vellum set aside with others for lighting the stove. His quick and practised eye detected their antiquity, and he found on examination that they contained a portion of the Septuagint. These leaves he easily obtained from the monks, and soon afterwards published. But it was not till 1859 that he first saw the great manuscript of which they formed a part. He was that year travelling under the patronage of the Emperor of Russia. And being once more at the above-named monastery, he had on the 4th of February the whole manuscript which he had so ardently desired to find

put into his hands. He looked at it with almost overwhelming joy and surprise. And the brethren could refuse nothing to one who was so highly honoured by their great patron and protector the Czar. Permission was readily accorded to him to copy the manuscript, and the Codex itself was soon afterwards sent as a present to Alexander II. It is now in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg, and was published in 1862 as a fitting memorial of the thousandth anniversary of the Russian Empire.

This is an unspeakably precious manuscript. For one thing, it has the advantage over all the others of containing the New Testament complete. It also comprises the Greek text of the Epistle of Barnabas, and part of that of the writings of Hermas, two of the Apostolic Fathers whose works had previously been known as a whole only through a Latin translation. Tischendorf was naturally disposed to exaggerate somewhat both the antiquity and value of his wonderful discovery. He even placed the Sinaitic earlier than the Vatican manuscript, but in this few scholars are inclined to follow him. He also adopted some impossible readings on the sole authority of this Codex, and, in general, allowed it undue weight in the establishment of the New Testament text. But avoiding these extremes, the value of the manuscript is universally and gratefully

admitted by scholars. It cannot be dated very much later than the Vatican Codex, belonging undoubtedly to the fourth century. And though it contains many obvious errors, it yields assistance of a kind most precious towards the settlement of the true text of the New Testament.

Such are by far the most important of the Uncial manuscripts, and it is unnecessary here to describe any of the rest. Nor shall I enter on any description of the Cursives. As has been already stated, these are very numerous ; and though as a rule they are far less important than the more ancient manuscripts, some of them are, nevertheless, exceedingly valuable. It is, of course, quite conceivable that a Cursive manuscript should present a text really better than that of any existing Uncial. For, though a manuscript may date, say from the eleventh century, it might have been accurately copied from one belonging to the second. This is possible, though such may not be found actually to have been the case. And, therefore, all the Cursives, no less than the Uncials, must be most carefully examined and duly appreciated by the textual critic while he pursues those arduous labours which have it for their object to approximate as closely as possible to the original text of Holy Scripture.

The next most important source of various readings

is that furnished by ancient versions of the New Testament. We have the utmost certainty that some of these were made at a date considerably higher than can be claimed for any manuscript at present known to exist. They thus furnish proof with regard to the prevailing text of the New Testament at a very early period in the history of Christianity.

The following are the ancient versions which are less or more available for the purposes of textual criticism. Some special drawbacks which exist to their use in this respect will be afterwards briefly noticed.

*Syriac Versions.* Of these the most important are the Peshito, the Philoxenian, the Harclean, and the Curetonian. By far the best of these is the Peshito (*i.e.*, Simple), which is truly an admirable translation. There is no doubt that it was made in the second century, and were we sure that we possessed it in its original form it would thus be of the very highest authority. The other Syriac versions do not rank high as translations, and the Curetonian embraces only fragments of the Gospels.

*Latin Versions.* So prevalent was the Greek language in Rome for several generations after the commencement of our era, that no need of a translation was felt by the inhabitants of that city. Accordingly, the first Latin version appears to have been made not in Italy but in North Africa. We know

nothing of its history. It was used by Tertullian and others about the beginning of the third century. Some excellent manuscripts containing it still exist. The very learned St. Jerome set himself to the revision of this version about the end of the fourth century. He improved it greatly both in regard to style and fidelity to the original ; but it was not till two centuries had elapsed that his work took the place of the *Old Latin*, and became the Vulgate of the Roman Church.

*Gothic Version.* This version was made by Bishop Ulphilas about the middle of the fourth century. It is not now known to exist in its original completeness. There is a celebrated “Silver Manuscript” of the Gospels preserved in the University of Upsala. The letters of this handsome manuscript are marvellously uniform, and its name is derived from the fact that they are written throughout in silver, except the initial letters of sections, which are written in gold. Belonging, as the version of Ulphilas does, to so high an antiquity as the fourth century, it is possessed of great weight in determining the text which had then become prevalent in the Church.

*Egyptian Versions.* There are two Egyptian versions, which are now known respectively as the *Memphitic* and the *Thebaic*. Before the fact of their independence was established, they both went under the

common name of *Coptic*. This appellation was derived from Coptos, a very ancient city of Upper Egypt. The term Memphitic points out the version which was used in Lower Egypt, and was taken from the capital city of the district ; while Thebaic indicates the version used in Upper Egypt, and was, in like manner, derived from the chief town of the country. The Thebaic version is supposed, on good grounds, to have been formed in the first half of the third century, and to have been followed by the Memphitic not much later. Both versions will be found more and more valuable for the purposes of criticism the more fully they are studied. Besides these, there are some fragments of a version which has been called the *Bashmurić*, and which was evidently related to the Thebaic.

*The Armenian Version.* This version cannot be placed higher than the fifth century. It seems to have been begun soon after the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. Up to that period the Armenian Christians appear to have used the Syriac version ; but two native scholars who had attended the Council brought home with them the New Testament in Greek, and from that a translation was made into the language of the country. The Armenian version cannot be deemed of very great importance in textual criticism.

*The Æthiopic Version.* This is a translation of the Scriptures in the ancient language of Abyssinia. It

seems to have been formed about the sixth or seventh century. There is every reason to believe that it was taken immediately from the Greek, though the meaning of the original was frequently mistaken. No very exact edition has yet been issued, and the version is not possessed of much authority.

The other ancient versions of the New Testament are the Georgian (sixth century), the Arabic (several recensions, the most ancient belonging to the eighth century), Slavonic (ninth century), Anglo-Saxon (from the Latin, eighth to eleventh century), and Persian versions (of varying and doubtful dates). These versions, with all later ones, though taken from the Greek, are too modern to have much weight in the settlement of the true text.

The deductions which must be made from the value of even the most ancient versions as testifying to the true text of Scripture are many and serious. First, their genuine readings are often doubtful. It is obvious that they were as liable to corruption in the process of being transcribed as the New Testament itself, or even more so, since greater pains would naturally be taken in copying the sacred original than a mere translation. Again, there is reason to believe that some of the most valuable versions, such as the Syriac Peshito, do not now exist in their primitive condition. They seem to have been conformed to

the prevalent text of the fourth century, and thus fail us as witnesses to that which was more ancient. On this account we cannot confidently press the authority of the existing Peshito in behalf, for example, of the Doxology of the Lord's Prayer. Again, in some few instances the authors of the versions appear from doctrinal bias to have departed from the original text. Thus Ulphilas, who had adopted Arian views, has inserted in the Gothic version at Philipp. ii. 6, the words "likeness to God," which would never suggest the true Greek text implying "equality with God." Lastly, even the best versions have frequently mistaken the meaning of the original, and may thus tend only to mislead as respects the genuine text. Suppose, in illustration, that a question were to arise with regard to the Greek expression corresponding to the English words "in the bush," at Mark xii. 26, and Luke xx. 37. In that case, the Authorised Version would inevitably suggest a wrong preposition, since it has here quite mistranslated the Greek. The meaning of the original is not "*in* the bush," as if referring to locality, but "*at* the Bush," denoting that portion of the Old Testament which was known among the Jews under the title of "the Bush." On all these grounds, therefore, the Biblical scholar must use the ancient versions as witnesses to the genuine text of Scripture with great caution and discrimination.

The only remaining source of various readings in the New Testament is that found in the citations of its text by ancient writers. And here it might at first be thought that we have access to more primitive and therefore more valuable testimony than that which is furnished by either manuscripts or versions. The stream of quotations from the New Testament begins even in the first century, and flows on with ever-increasing volume in the succeeding generations. When we reflect that Clement of Rome begins to quote from the sacred writings so early as A.D. 97, when his epistle seems to have been written, and that he is followed by such voluminous writers as Justin Martyr and Irenæus in the second century, as Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen, in the third century, it might well be imagined that we should thus obtain most valuable and trustworthy guidance as to the primitive text of the New Testament.

But here again there are very serious drawbacks. No doubt, these early Fathers quote most copiously from Scripture, so that the substance of the whole New Testament could easily be collected from their pages. But important deductions must be made from the value of their writings as authorities in textual criticism. For, first, the manuscripts of their works which we possess are comparatively modern—few indeed rising above the tenth century, and thus their

genuine readings are often doubtful. And, next, they generally quote from memory, not feeling the need, and not possessing the means, of aiming at that verbal exactness called for at the present day. They had none of those facilities of reference which we possess. The turning to a passage and verifying it, would, in their case, have implied an amount of labour, of which, with our Bibles divided into chapters and verses, we can hardly conceive. Besides, there can be no doubt that many passages would come to be loosely and popularly quoted, without any suspicion that a departure was thus made from the true text. This happens constantly among ourselves with respect to the Authorised Version. How often will one see or hear Deut. xxxiii. 25, quoted thus, “As thy *day is* so shall thy strength be,” whereas the true reading is, “As thy *days*, &c.”\*

On the whole, then, there is reason for acquiescing in the following judgment with regard to the value, as respects textual criticism, to be attached to the quotations made by ancient writers from the New Testament. “Not only is this kind of testimony fragmentary and not (like that of versions) continuous, so that it often fails where we should most wish for information; but the Fathers were better theologians than critics;

\* See for a numerous list of such misquotations Eadie’s *English Bible*, ii. 328 ff.

they frequently quoted loosely or from memory, often no more of a passage than their immediate purpose required ; what they actually wrote has been found peculiarly liable to change on the part of copyists and unskilful editors ; they can therefore be implicitly trusted—even as to the manuscripts which lay before them—only in the comparatively few places wherein their own direct appeal to their codices, or the course of their argument, or the current of their exposition, renders it manifest what readings they approved. In other cases the same author perpetually cites the self-same text under two or more various forms ; in the Gospels it is often impossible to determine to which of the three earlier ones reference is made ; and, on the whole, Scriptural quotations from ecclesiastical writers are of so much less consideration than ancient translations, that where they are single and unsupported, they may safely be disregarded altogether. An *express* citation, however, by a really careful Father of the first four or five centuries (as Origen, for example), if supported by manuscript authority, and countenanced by the best versions, claims our respectful attention, and powerfully vindicates the reading which it favours.” \*

\* Scrivener's *Introduction*, p. 368.

## CHAPTER III.

HISTORY AND CHARACTER OF THE GREEK TEXT ON  
WHICH THE AUTHORISED VERSION WAS FOUNDED.

WHEN an English version of the New Testament is put into our hands as furnishing a transcript in our own language of God's revelation of Himself through Jesus Christ, it is of the most vital importance to be assured of the trustworthiness of the text on which that version has been based. Without this everything else must be comparatively worthless. What we want to know is the exact message which has been addressed to our race by Heaven. And the first essential to this is purity of the original text. It matters not how smoothly a version may read, how pleasing may be its contents, or how venerable even may be the antiquity which it claims. The first and gravest question to be asked regarding it has respect to the faithfulness with which the text on which it was based represented the true and original word of God. How then, we anxiously inquire, does the case stand concerning this point with the Authorised English Version?

Before being able to give a full answer to this

question it is necessary to trace the history of the earliest printed editions of the Greek New Testament. This history will gradually lead us on to the text which was made use of in the preparation of the Authorised Version, and we shall be enabled to form a judgment respecting its character.

We cannot but feel it somewhat remarkable that so long a time elapsed between the invention of the art of printing and the passing of an edition of the Greek New Testament through the press. It is well known that the first book ever printed was the Bible, but this was in the form of the Vulgate. A Latin edition of the Scriptures, very handsomely got up, issued from the press at Mentz in 1452; and a few copies of this interesting and precious publication are known to be still in existence at the present day. The Hebrew Bible was also printed, under the auspices of some wealthy Jews, in 1488. But the century which had witnessed the invention of printing was allowed to close without any attempt having been made to prepare a printed edition of the Greek New Testament. Some brief passages of the Gospels from the first chapter of St. Luke—the sacred songs of the Virgin Mary and of Zacharias—had, indeed, been added to a Greek edition of the Psalms printed at Milan in 1481; but no one as yet seems to have conceived the idea of issuing a printed edition of the whole New Testa-

ment. The cause of this probably was that the Greek language was still but very imperfectly known to theologians. The “new learning” was as yet only struggling through many difficulties into acceptance, and gradually winning to itself the admiration and affection of those noble men who afterwards cultivated it with so much energy and devotedness.

To the able and excellent Cardinal Ximenes, Primate of Spain, belongs the honour of having first projected an edition of the entire Greek New Testament. His plan was to embrace it in a Polyglot Bible, intended to include both the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Greek Septuagint version with the Chaldee Targum of Onkelos and the Latin Vulgate. The fifth volume, which is devoted to the New Testament, was first printed, and it bears on its last page as the date of its completion, January, 10, 1514. But its publication was delayed, apparently, at first, with the view of waiting for the remaining volumes. The last of these, numbered as the fourth, is stated to have been finished on July 10, 1517. But the exemplary prelate who had originated and superintended this great undertaking died soon afterwards (Nov. 8, 1517), and the issue of the volume, was, in consequence, still further delayed. It was not till March 22, 1520, that Pope Leo X. formally sanctioned its publication. Thus came forth at length what is known as the

*Complutensian* edition of the New Testament, Complutum being the Latin name for Alcalà, where the work was prepared.

Meanwhile, however, important steps had been taken in another quarter. The illustrious Erasmus comes into view, a man to whom modern thought is, in so many ways, under such deep and lasting obligations. That great scholar was in England in 1515, and on April 17th of that year he received a request from Froben, an eminent printer at Basle, to prepare for publication an edition of the Greek New Testament. Though encumbered by other literary labours, Erasmus set about this work with characteristic diligence, and completed it within the too short period of a few months—by February, 1516. The work was immediately published, and thus the original text of the New Testament was, for the first time, given to the world.

No small eagerness would, naturally, be shown by scholars to possess the sacred text. Accordingly, we find that the demand was, for those days, great. The first edition of Erasmus was reprinted, with corrections amounting to about 200, by Aldus, at Venice, in 1518. A second edition, with more than 300 improvements, was issued by Erasmus himself in 1519. This was followed by a third edition in 1522, chiefly remarkable as containing, for the first time, the famous text

1 John v. 7. Erasmus had not till now seen the Complutensian edition, but he was able to avail himself of it in the preparation of his own fourth, which came out in 1527. He died in 1536, having issued a fifth edition in the previous year, differing only in four places from the preceding. The *fourth* edition of Erasmus is thus the most important, and became the basis of all subsequent texts, until what is known as the “Received Text” was formed.

After the death of Erasmus an edition of the Greek New Testament was published by Colinæus at Paris in 1543. But, although this edition was corrected in more than a hundred places from the authority of additional manuscripts, it may be left out of account as having exercised little subsequent influence. The true successor of Erasmus in this department was Robert Stephens the famous Parisian printer. He issued two editions in 1546 and 1549, having availed himself in these of some manuscripts in the Royal Library, and of the Complutensian text. But his great edition was the third, issued in 1550. This edition is remarkable as containing the first collection of various readings, amounting, it has been reckoned, to 2,194. But though these had been collected from a considerable number of manuscripts, no critical use was made of them. The text of Erasmus was closely followed, and readings found in

it were even clung to when opposed to the authority of all the manuscripts. The fourth edition of Stephens was published at Geneva in 1551. In this edition the New Testament is, for the first time, divided into *verses*—an invention of Stephens. The text remained the same as in the previous edition.

Beza, the Reformer, next appears as an editor of the Greek New Testament. He published five editions, the first in 1565, the second in 1576, the third in 1582, the fourth in 1589, and the fifth in 1598. These editions varied somewhat among themselves, but were based throughout upon the text of Stephens.

And now we have reached the interesting and important point of this sketch, as the history of the printed text of the New Testament just given has led us very near the date at which the Authorised English Version began to be made. It was commenced about 1604, when the above-named Greek texts were, in one form or another, generally circulated. Which of them, we ask with eagerness, formed the original from which our common English translation was derived? To this question the answer is, that Beza's edition of 1589 was the one usually followed. It had been based on Stephens's edition of 1550, and that again had been derived from the fourth edition of Erasmus, published in 1527. Such is the parentage

A. 157  
no. 3

of the Authorised Version—Beza, Stephens, Erasmus. What manuscript authority, let us ask, is thus represented?

Beginning with Erasmus, we find that his resources were meagre indeed, and that even the materials which he had were not fully utilised. It has already been noticed how hastily his first edition was prepared; indeed, he himself said of it that it “was rather tumbled headlong into the world than edited.” The manuscripts which he had in his possession are still preserved, one having been recovered some years ago after long being lost. Some of them bear in themselves the corrections which he made, and show too obvious marks of having been used as “copy” by the printer. They consisted of the following. In the Gospels he principally used a Cursive manuscript of the fifteenth or sixteenth century. This may still be seen at Basle, and is admitted by all to be of a very inferior character. He also possessed another Cursive manuscript of the twelfth century, or earlier, and occasionally referred to it. But though this is an excellent manuscript in the Gospels—one of the very best of the Cursives—Erasmus was ignorant of its value, and made little use of it. In the Acts and Epistles he chiefly followed a Cursive manuscript of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, with occasional reference to another of the fifteenth century. Both

these were of the ordinary type usually exhibited by the later manuscripts. For the Apocalypse he had only one mutilated manuscript. He had thus no documentary materials for publishing a complete edition of the Greek Testament. The consequence would have been that some verses must have been left wanting had not Erasmus taken the Vulgate and conjecturally re-translated the Latin into Greek. Hence has arisen the remarkable fact that in the text from which our Authorised Version was formed, and in the ordinary uncritical editions of the Greek current at the present day, there were, and are, words in the professed original for which no Divine authority can be pleaded, but which are entirely due to the learning and imagination of Erasmus.

As stated above, he availed himself of the Complutensian text to some extent in his subsequent editions. Scholars have been unable to ascertain with exactness the manuscripts which were employed in its formation. It was at one time thought that the famous Codex B was one of them. But this has been clearly disproved, and the manuscript authority on which it was based has been shown by internal evidence to have been not ancient, but modern. There is also some ground for suspecting that the editors occasionally, though rarely, allowed an undue influence to the Latin Vulgate. In printing the Old

Testament they gave the place of honour in the centre to the Latin, surrounding it on either side by the original Hebrew and the Septuagint translation. On this they make the curious and somewhat suggestive remark, that the Latin thus placed was like Christ crucified between the two thieves! The one thief was the Greek Church, which they regarded as heretical; and the other was the nation of the Jews, who were charged with having corrupted the Hebrew text wherever it differed from the Latin.

Stephens, who succeeded Erasmus in the work of editing the Greek Testament, had, as we have seen, a number of additional manuscripts at his command. Among these was one at least undoubtedly ancient, Codex D, formerly described. But he made very little use either of it or of any of the others in his possession. Almost the only important departure which Stephens made from the Erasmian text was in the Apocalypse, in which book he took advantage of the far better readings supplied by the Complutensian edition.

Beza received from Stephens a collection of various readings derived from no fewer than some five-and-twenty manuscripts, but he made little or no critical use of them. He was totally unaware of the value of the manuscript which bears his name, and thought that its publication was rather to be deprecated. He left the

text substantially as he had received it from Stephens, who, again, for his part, rarely deserts the fifth edition of Erasmus.

Thus, then, stood the text of the Greek New Testament when the revisers of the Bishops' Bible set themselves to form from it our present Authorised English Version. Not one of the four most ancient manuscripts was then known to be in existence. Even Codex D, which was known, had scarcely any weight assigned to it, and the whole Greek text had been based upon a very few modern manuscripts. The ancient versions had not been examined. No careful investigation had been made into the testimony to the primitive text borne by the Fathers. Textual criticism was still in its infancy, the materials for it had not been gathered, the principles of the science had not been studied, and the labours of Mill, Bentley, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and other great scholars, to secure the purity of the text of the New Testament, were as yet unheard of, and only to be put forth in the course of many future generations.

In these circumstances can it be wondered at that vast multitudes of changes will be found in the Revised English Version, owing to an amended text? The wonder really is that they are so few, or, at least, that they are, in general, of such small importance. When

we trace, as has been briefly done, the parentage of our English Bible, and when we see on what a slender basis of authority it rests, when we confront with this the enormous wealth of materials for settling the true Greek text which we possess at the present day, and the amount of labour which has been expended in applying them, we might well fear that the alterations requiring to be made in the Bible with which we have all our days been familiar should be of the most revolutionary character. But, blessed be God, such is not the case. No doctrine of the faith is in the slightest degree affected. False supports of important doctrines may be removed, and true defences of them may be supplied, but that is all. The Bible remains, for all practical purposes, totally unaffected. That is one grand result of the labours of the New Testament Revision Company, for which all English Christians have good reason to be thankful. They now know the utmost that Biblical science demands. No suspicion need in future haunt them that the Scriptural truths which they love are insecure. These have been proved to rest on an immovable foundation, and they will endure as long as the Divine Word that reveals them, "which liveth and abideth for ever."

But more than this, every loyal Christian heart should surely rejoice to have access, in as pure a form as possible, to the message sent us by our Father in

heaven. That is the great positive work which has been aimed at by the New Testament Company, and the fulfilment of which is presented in the Revised Version. English readers of the Scriptures have now the opportunity of making themselves acquainted with the New Testament in a form more nearly representing the primitive text than they ever had before. Most of the changes made hardly affect the sense, but many even of these alterations are highly interesting. Some few others are of great importance, and will naturally attract more attention from readers of the Revised Version. To these two classes of changes which have been required by an amendment of the text we shall advert at some length in the two following chapters.

## CHAPTER IV.

EXAMPLES OF MINOR CHANGES CAUSED BY A CHANGE  
OF TEXT.

IT may be that at first not a few of the changes or omissions in the Revised Version, due to a change in the original text, will be felt disagreeable by the English reader. The old familiar rhythm is disturbed, and the ear longs for the words to which it has been accustomed. It must be owned, too, that there *are* some changes and omissions due to the cause referred to which may worthily seem matter of regret. Thus, we can hardly exchange the beautiful precept, “Be courteous,” found at 1 Pet. iii. 8, in the Authorised Version, for the apparently tamer expression, “humble-minded,” in the Revised Version, without feeling that some loss has been incurred. And we cannot read Mark ix. 3, or Mark ix. 24, without wishing that the words “as snow” and “with tears,” which add to the graphic style of the narrative, had been retained. In the majority of cases, however, the changes caused by a change of text, will, on consideration, commend themselves as improvements. They will be found to impart greater clearness, terseness, or force, to the

Version. Thus, there is a vividness at Mark i. 27, “And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What is this? a new teaching! with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him,” which does not belong to the Authorised Version. Thus, again, it will be felt to be with the remarkable variation which occurs at 2 Cor. i. 20, where we read in the Revised Version, “For how many soever be the promises of God, in him is the yea: wherefore also through him is the Amen, unto the glory of God through us.” As has been well observed, the “*yea*” here “denotes the fulfilment of the promise on the part of God, and ‘*Amen*’ the recognition and thanksgiving on the part of the Church, a distinction which is obliterated by the received reading.”\* So, at 1 John v. 13, it is an obvious gain to get rid of the clumsy and almost absurd repetition which occurs in the Authorised Version, and to read simply, “These things have I written unto you, that ye may know ye have eternal life, unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God.” But whether the *true* readings be deemed improvements or not, they should always be welcomed simply on the ground of their genuineness. To find out what is true is the supreme object of Biblical science; and while, no doubt, there

\* Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, p. 32.

may often seem an artificial attractiveness about what is erroneous, there should always be felt a sovereign majesty in truth.

With these remarks, let us look at some of the minor changes which have been made in the Revised Version owing to a change of text. I shall first take a few from each of the Gospels, and then some from the other books of the New Testament.

*St. Matthew's Gospel.* At chap. v. 22, the Revised Version omits the words "without a cause." The evidence from manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, is here not quite conclusive, but the internal evidence is clear. It is obvious that a strong temptation presented itself to transcribers to insert the words, in order to soften the apparent harshness of the precept, whereas, had they existed in the primitive text, it is scarcely possible to account for their having been dropped. There is little, if any, doubt, therefore, that they ought to disappear. At chap. xviii. 17 we read in the Revised Version, "Why askest thou me of that which is good? One there is who is good: but if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments." The external evidence is decidedly in favour of this reading, embracing, as it does, κ, B, D, &c., but it is the internal evidence which is conclusive. We formerly saw how prone copyists were to conform parallel passages, and here St. Matthew's text, as re-

presented in the Authorised Version, has been harmonised with those of St. Mark and St. Luke. Besides the question of the young ruler, “What good thing shall I do ?” is aptly answered by the words, “Why askest thou me of that which is good?” At chap. xxv. 6 we read in the Revised Version, “But at midnight a cry is made, Behold the bridegroom : come ye forth to meet him.” The word “cometh” is omitted on overwhelming authority ; it had evidently slipped in as a supplement from the working of the mind of the transcriber on the passage before him.

*St. Mark’s Gospel.* At chap. vi. 20 we read in the Revised Version, “Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and a holy, and kept him safe ; and when he heard him, he *was much perplexed*, and heard him gladly.” Here the common reading, “And did many things,” is undoubtedly supported by many of the best authorities ; but the case is such that we cannot conceive of the unusual Greek word for “perplexed” being substituted for the very common word for “did,” while the converse supposition that a transcriber here meeting with an unfamiliar expression changed it into one with which he was well acquainted, is easy and natural. At chap. ix. 22, 23, we read in the Revised Version, “If thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us. And Jesus said unto him, If thou canst ! all things are possible to him that

believeth." This is a beautiful emendation. Jesus takes up the doubting words of the father, and, after repeating them, adds that strong assertion of the power of faith which follows. The change is abundantly supported by ancient authority; and it is obvious that the enfeebling "believe" of the common text has somehow slipped in as a supplement.

*St. Luke's Gospel.* At chap. xvi. 9 we find the interesting change of "it" for "ye," and read in the Revised Version, "Make to yourselves friends out of the mammon of unrighteousness, that, when it shall fail, they (the friends whom you have thus made) may receive you into the eternal tabernacles." At chap. xxiv. 17 a somewhat different turn is given to the narrative by the insertion of a Greek verb in the text, and we read thus in the Revised Version, "What communications are these that ye have one with another as ye walk? And they stood still, looking sad." Again, at verse 46 of the same chapter, the proper reading is, "Thus it is written that the Christ should suffer," the common text having been derived from verse 26, according to a process familiar to transcribers.

*St. John's Gospel.* At chap. vi. 11 we find in the common text an obvious case of accommodation to the parallel passage in Matt. xiv. 19, and the verse properly runs as in the Revised Version, "Jesus there-

fore took the loaves, and having given thanks, he distributed to them that were set down." At chap. xiii. 24 we have in the Revised Version a characteristic utterance of St. Peter which is lost in the ordinary text. He seems to have imagined that John, as specially the confidant of Christ, would know what the disciples wished to ascertain, and exclaimed, "Tell us who it is of whom he speaketh." At chap. xx. 16 the amended text has restored the expression "in the Hebrew tongue," which, by the exception which it specially marks out, serves to indicate the language generally made use of in public intercourse by Christ and His disciples.

*The Acts of the Apostles.* At chap. xv. 23 we find an interesting example of the alteration which may take place in the meaning from a very slight change in the text. The words "and the" are simply omitted, and we then read, "The apostles and the elder brethren," instead of "The apostles, and the elders, and the brethren." At chap. xvi. 7 we find an exception to the general rule that a shorter reading is to be preferred to a longer, for the true text undoubtedly is, "the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not." At chap. xviii. 5 we find a striking illustration of the tendency to replace what was unusual or not understood by what was common and familiar; for "Paul was pressed in the spirit" has there taken

the place of the true text, “Paul was constrained by the word.”

*The Epistle to the Romans.* A very remarkable change has been made at chap. iv. 19. In accordance with all the great Uncials, the negative in the verse is omitted, so as to read, “he considered his own body now become dead,” the point being that, though he fully took into account his own state, yet he did not stumble at the Divine promise. At chap. v. 1, after long hesitation, criticism has clearly decided that instead of “we have,” the true reading is “let us have.” The text of B in this passage is now certainly known to be in favour of that which stands in the Revised Version, and it is supported by A, C, D, &c, the most important versions, and many of the Fathers. At chap. vii. 6 a reading was introduced by Beza into his third edition, which was a mere conjecture of his own, and is supported by not a single manuscript or version. It stands, however, in the common English Bible, which translates it, “*that being dead* wherein we were held,” instead of the true text as rendered in the Revised Version, “*having died to that* wherein we were holden.” At chap. xvi. 5 we should certainly read “the first fruits of Asia,” instead of “the first fruits of Achaia,” the mistaken reading having probably arisen from the transcriber having 1 Cor. xvi. 15 in his mind.

*The First Epistle to the Corinthians.* The most interesting changes in this Epistle are those which have been made in the eleventh chapter, which contains an account of the institution of the Lord's Supper. At ver. 24 the words "Take, eat," have been omitted, as having scarcely a shadow of authority. They were doubtless interpolated from Matt. xxvi. 26. In the same verse the word "broken" is also left out; it was probably a supplement introduced by the copyists. In ver. 26 "this cup" becomes "the cup" in the Revised Version; the common text was due to a desire for uniformity in the two clauses. In ver. 29 the word translated "unworthily" has been omitted as certainly spurious; it was brought in from ver. 27, where it is as certainly genuine. At chap. xiii. 3 a various reading occurs, which, though very properly not placed in the text, will be found in the margin of the Revised Version as having very great support from excellent authorities. It deserves notice as illustrating how one Greek word might be mistaken for another which it closely resembled. Here a difference of only a single letter leads to the so great difference of rendering in English, as, "that I may be burned," and "that I may glory."\*

*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians.* There are

\* The two Greek words are *καυθήσωμαι* and *καυχήσωμαι*.

no very noticeable alterations made in this Epistle owing to a change of text. Perhaps the most interesting is at chap. xii. 19, where quite a different turn is given to the passage in the Revised Version, in consequence of one word being altered in the original. The Apostle knew well that his elaborate vindication of himself might be misunderstood by the Corinthians, as if he were anxious to gain *their* favourable judgment on his conduct, and to meet this mistake he says:—“Ye think all this time that we are excusing ourselves unto you. In the sight of God speak we in Christ. But all things, beloved, are for your edifying.”

*The Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians.* At Gal. iv. 14 a new turn is given to the passage by the pronoun being changed in the original. St. Paul, instead of there speaking of “*my* temptation,” says, “that which was a temptation *to you* in my flesh ye despised not nor rejected,” surely far more in accordance with the context. At Eph. v. 29 we get rid in the Revised Version of the strange declaration, “of his flesh, and of his bones,” and read simply, in accordance with the true text, “we are members of his body.” At Philipp. i. 16, 17, the two verses must, by overwhelming authority, be transposed, and read as in the Revised Version. At Col. ii. 18 we come upon a passage presenting great difficulty both as to the ~~the~~ text and the right interpretation. But evidence

leads us clearly to reject the “not” found before “seen” in the common text. The Apostle is blaming those who dwell in the region of sense rather than that of faith, and this is the meaning given to his words in the Revised Version. It is evident that the ancient copyists did not understand the passage, and that the insertion of the negative was due to their desire of making it, as they thought, intelligible.

*The Epistles to the Thessalonians, and the Pastoral Epistles.* Few changes worth notice have been made in the Epistles to the Thessalonians on account of a change of text. It may be noted, however, that the usual designation of our Saviour in these Epistles is “our Lord Jesus,” and not “our Lord Jesus Christ.” See 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 11, iii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 12 (first clause); and compare ii. 8 in the Revised Version. The full title occurs at 1 Thess. i. 1, v. 28, 2 Thess. i. 2, &c., but the shorter form seems characteristic of these Epistles. On the other hand, “Christ Jesus,” and not “Jesus Christ,” appears as the favourite appellation for our Lord in the Pastoral Epistles. Compare with Authorised Version 1 Tim. iv. 6, v. 21, 2 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, Tit. i. 4, in the Revised Version. It deserves in this connection to be noticed further that the two versions are coincident in the use of the form “Christ Jesus” in the following passages: 1 Tim. i. 12, i. 14, ii. 5, iii. 13, vi. 13; 2 Tim. i. 1 (second

clause), i. 2, i. 9, i. 13, ii. 1, ii. 10, iii. 12, iii. 15. The title “Christ Jesus” thus seems in its very frequent use a marked peculiarity of the Pastoral Epistles, and serves as a sort of *nexus* to bind them all together.

*The Epistle to Philemon and the Epistle to the Hebrews.* Almost the only changes of any interest in the Epistle to Philemon are at ver. 2, where we read, “and to Apphia our sister,” for “and to our beloved Apphia,” the epithet “beloved” having apparently been substituted to correspond to ver. 1; and “I had,” for “we have,” in ver. 7, in which some critics also read “grace” instead of “joy,” but without sufficient authority. At Heb. iv. 2 overwhelming critical evidence compels us to accept the somewhat strange rendering of the Revised Version. Many critics of high name have been tempted to abide by the apparently far simpler and more satisfactory reading which is represented in the Authorised Version; but faithfulness to the laws of evidence and grammar will not permit of such a course. At chap. x. 34, the personal reference to the writer of the Epistle is exchanged for the general reference to “them that were in bonds,” and this change has an important bearing on the very difficult question of authorship. At chap. xi. 13 the Greek words rendered “and were persuaded of them” have no

right whatever to a place in the text. The beautiful and exact rendering of the original here given in the Revised Version will be noticed afterwards, when we come to treat of mistakes of translation in the Authorised Version.

*The Catholic Epistles.* In the Epistle of James the remarkable change which is found in the Revised Version at chap. i. 19 is due to the change of a single letter in the Greek.\* The evidence is decisive ; and the principle here applies that a more difficult reading is to be preferred to one that is easy and frequent. In the first Epistle of Peter, at chap. ii. 21, the confusion of the pronouns found in the Authorised Version, which reads, “Christ also suffered for *us*, leaving *us* an example, that *ye* should follow his steps,” is, by a change of text, escaped in the Revised Version. The change made at 2 Pet. iii. 2, which cannot fail to strike the reader, has the sanction of all the great Uncials, and of the best versions. In like manner the insertion of the words “and we are,” in 1 John iii. 1, rests on the most decisive manuscript and Patristic authority. In 2 John ver. 8 the confusion of pronouns again found in the Authorised Version is by a change of text corrected in the Revised Version. In 3 John ver. 12 the glaring incongruity of addressing in the plural Gaius, to whom the Epistle is addressed,

\* The two Greek words are *Ιστε* and *ωστε*.

is removed by the adoption of the correct reading, “thou knowest.” In the Epistle of Jude ver. 1, through a mistake of one Greek word for another,\* there is read in the Authorised Version, “*sanctified* by God the Father,” instead of “*beloved* in God the Father.”

*The Apocalypse.* As might be inferred from what has been said in the preceding chapter the text of the Book of Revelation on which the Authorised Version rests was of the most unsatisfactory character. Accordingly, numerous corrections of the original have led to change in the Revised Version. One of the most important of these alterations is found at chap. xvii. 8. The Authorised Version refers at the close of this verse to “the beast, that was, and is not, *and yet is*”—truly an enigmatical declaration—but by substitution of the true text we attain to the more intelligible statement which the reader will here find in the Revised Version. Some interesting changes have also been made in the concluding chapter of the Book. Thus, in the third clause of the eleventh verse a very puzzling reading of the common text—which, by the way, ought not to be rendered as in the Authorised Version, but can only mean, “let him *be justified* still”—has been exchanged for one which

\* The two words which have been confounded are ἡγαπημένοις and ἡγιασμένοις.

yields a plain and satisfactory sense—"let him do righteousness still." And in the fourteenth verse, instead of these words of the Authorised Version, "Blessed are they that *do his commandments*, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city," we must read, far more in accordance with the analogy of Scripture, "Blessed are they that *wash their robes*, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city."

## CHAPTER V.

MORE IMPORTANT CHANGES DUE TO A CHANGE  
OF TEXT.

PROBABLY the first great change which will strike the reader of the Revised Version is the entire omission of the doxology of the Lord's Prayer at Matt. vi. 13. The reasons for this omission are conclusive. First, the clause is not found in any of the great Uncials, A, B, C, D, which contain the passage. Secondly, it is not noticed by the earliest Fathers in their expositions of the Lord's Prayer. True, Chrysostom and others recognise it in the fourth century, but this cannot outweigh the fact that it is wholly unnoticed by Origen in the third. The internal evidence, too, is somewhat against it, as an interruption of the context. There is, indeed, one weighty argument in its favour. It is found in most of the ancient versions, such as the *A*ethiopic, the Armenian, the Gothic, and, above all, the Syriac. Versions, it is obvious, are far more valuable as witnesses to the existence of *clauses* than they can be in regard to individual *words*. And could we be sure that the doxology existed from the first in such an ancient version as the Peshito Syriac,

its genuineness would perhaps no longer be disputed. But, as was formerly remarked, we cannot insist on the authority of the Syriac in support of the passage. This is felt all the more from the varying form which is presented by the doxology in the Curetonian version, which omits altogether the words "and the power." Besides, it does not exist in the Latin Vulgate, a very important witness. Upon the whole, criticism must pronounce decidedly against the clause as forming part of the original text; and it is, accordingly, not admitted into the Revised Version.

*Mark xvi. 9—20.* The reader will be struck by the appearance which this long paragraph presents in the Revised Version. Although inserted, it is marked off by a considerable space from the rest of the Gospel. A note is also placed on the margin containing a brief explanation of this, but it may be well here to say something more respecting such an important section of the Evangelical history. The case, then, stands as follows. It cannot be denied that there is something peculiar about the paragraph. We find that it has no place in  $\kappa$ , B, the two oldest manuscripts in our possession. It is true that the writer of B has left a blank space at the end of St. Mark's Gospel, clearly indicating that he knew of something more that *might* be inserted, but the fact remains that he did *not* insert it. Again, as Tregelles has remarked,

“Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Victor of Antioch, Severus of Antioch, Jerome, as well as other writers, especially Greeks, testify that these verses were *not* written by St. Mark, or not found in the best copies.” \* Moreover, it must, I think, be admitted that the style of the passage is not that of the Evangelist. Not only are there seventeen words in the compass of only twelve verses which are nowhere else made use of by St. Mark, but the general complexion of the paragraph is unlike that of the gospel. This much may be urged against the genuineness. But, on the other hand, in support of it we are told to reflect how improbable it is that a writer of the Gospel history would abruptly end his narrative with the statement contained in verse 8. That may be admitted, and yet there may have been circumstances unknown to us that compelled the author to make such a sudden termination. How many works might be referred to, such as Macaulay’s “History of England,” which close abruptly, for the too-sufficient reason that death arrested the pen of the writer ! But again it is argued that Irenæus quotes the passage, without the slightest misgiving, in the second century. True, and that is most weighty proof of the *authority* assigned to the passage even from the earliest times, but does by no means prove the authorship of St. Mark. Nor

\* *Introduction*, p. 435.

can the evidence of versions be deemed conclusive, for reasons which have been already stated. On the whole, a fair survey of all the facts of the case seems to lead us to these conclusions : first, that the passage is not the immediate production of St. Mark ; and secondly, that it is, nevertheless, possessed of full canonical authority. We cannot ascertain its author, but we are sure he must have been one who belonged to the circle of the Apostles. And, in accordance with this view of the paragraph, it is marked off from the words with which, for some unknown reason, the Gospel of St. Mark ended ; while, at the same time, it is inserted, without the least misgiving, as an appendix to that gospel in the Revised Version.

*John vii. 53—viii. 11.* This section of the Gospel narrative stands on much the same footing with that just considered. It is enclosed within brackets in the Revised Version, and is accompanied by an explanatory note on the margin: More, however, than that note is necessary to set forth the real authority belonging to the passage. It is not found in any one of the first-rate Uncials, nor in the Syriac and other ancient versions. There is no evidence that it was known to Origen, Chrysostom, and others of the early Fathers. It is obelised as doubtful by many of the manuscripts which contain it. The texts in which it has come down to us vary exceedingly among them-

selves. And, lastly, as against its being an integral portion of St. John's Gospel, it has no connection with the context, and its style is totally different from that of the Evangelist. On the other hand, it is found in the ancient Uncial D, though in a text which varies much from the received. It was known to St. Jerome in the fourth century, who expressly testifies that it existed in his days "in many manuscripts both Greek and Latin." Augustine about the same date affirms that "some of but weak faith, or rather enemies of the true faith," had expunged it from their copies of the New Testament, and adds that they did so with an ethical purpose, fearing lest the passage might seem to grant impunity to sin. It would appear from Eusebius that even Papias, who lived in the early part of the second century, was familiar with the story, though that of course does not prove that he knew it as existing in St. John's Gospel. Finally, the narrative itself breathes the very spirit of Christ and Christianity. Now, in these circumstances, what judgment can criticism pronounce regarding it? The right conclusion probably is that it is no part of St. John's Gospel, and yet is a perfectly true narrative which has descended to us from the Apostolic age. Some critics think that its proper place would be at the end of Luke xxi., where it is really placed in some of the best of the Cursive manuscripts. Such being

the facts of the case as regards this famous paragraph, it has properly been inserted in the text, but marked off from the context and enclosed in brackets in the Revised Version.

*Coloss. ii. 2.* A very important departure has here been made, on textual grounds, from the Authorised Version. But, as the reader will observe from the note on the margin, this has not been done with much confidence. The fact is that, in the present conflicting state of the evidence, it is impossible to say, with any approach to certainty, what was here the original text. There are many varieties of reading. First, we find the very short form, “to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God,” without any reference to Christ at all. Next, we have “to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, Christ,” nothing being interposed between the words “God” and “Christ.” Thirdly, there is the form, “to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, which is Christ.” Fourthly, some good manuscripts read “to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, the Father of Christ.” And lastly, there is the reading of the mass of the Cursives represented in our Authorised Version, “to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ.” The three last readings are, by the general consent of critics, set aside, as manifest amplifications of the original text. We are, therefore, left

to choose between the first and second forms. Such choice is by no means easy, and critics are greatly divided on the point. According to a principle often already alluded to, the shorter form should, other things being equal, obtain the preference. But in this case there is scarcely equality. The curt form “of God” is supported only by one late Uncial, and some good Cursives. The longer form “of God, Christ,” has the weighty authority of B, and of Hilary among the Fathers. The fourth form mentioned above is supported by  $\kappa$ , A, C, and thus has perhaps more external evidence than any of the rest, but can scarcely be accepted on account of internal considerations. In these circumstances, we conclude with some confidence that the true text of the passage is that represented in the Revised Version.

1 *Tim.* iii. 16. The English reader will probably be startled to find that the familiar text, “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh,” has been exchanged in the Revised Version for the following, “And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifested in the flesh.” A note on the margin states that “the word *God*, in place of *He who*, rests on no sufficient ancient authority;” and it may be well that, in a passage of so great importance, the reader should be convinced that such is the case.

What, then, let us inquire, is the amount of evidence which can be produced in support of the reading “*God*?” This is soon stated. Not one of the early Fathers can be certainly quoted for it. None of the very ancient versions support it. No Uncial witnesses to it, with the doubtful exception of A. The most diverse opinions have been expressed by critics as to the true text of this manuscript. To let the reader understand how this should be, it must be stated that the difference between two such similar forms as **O C** and **Θ C** decides whether the reading shall be “who” or “*God*.” Now, it cannot be wondered at that in a manuscript not less than fourteen hundred years old, it is difficult to say whether the decisive lines exist or not. But this difficulty has been greatly increased by an unfortunate attempt to escape from it altogether. Some very orthodox but presumptuous hand has drawn a dark line in the middle of the **O**, so as to render it certain that “*God*” is the reading of the manuscript. But the effort must now be made to overlook that modern touch entirely, and decide whether or not there is any trace of an original line in the heart of **O**. Hence the diversity of opinion among critics. Bishop Ellicott declares for **O C** “*indisputably*, after minute personal inspection.”\* Dr. Scrivener, on the other hand says, “I have always felt convinced with

\* *Comm. on 1 Tim.*, p. 51.

Berriman and the earlier collators that Cod. A read Θ C.\* The truth probably is, that in the now worn condition of the leaf containing the passage, it is impossible for any one by personal inspection at the present day to determine the original reading of the manuscript. Much weight, however, is due to the opinion of those who had an opportunity of examining the Codex soon after it was brought to England, and when it must have been far easier to decide the question at issue. Now, these appear to be almost unanimous that the reading was Θ C. But even granting that the weighty suffrage of the Alexandrian manuscript is in favour of "God," far more evidence can be produced in support of "who." \* and probably C witness to this reading, and it has also powerful testimony from the versions and Fathers. Moreover, the relative "who," is a far more difficult reading than "God," and could hardly have been substituted for the latter. On every ground, therefore, we conclude that this interesting and important passage must stand as it has been given in the Revised Version.

*i Peter iii. 15.* The importance of the departure here made from the Authorised Version may not at first be obvious to the reader, but will become so on a very little consideration. It amounts to nothing less

\* *Introduction*, p. 553.

than the identification of *Christ* with *Jehovah*. For, as all admit, the Apostle here borrows his language from *Isa.* viii. 13, where we read “Sanctify the ‘Lord of Hosts himself.’” Since, therefore, the language made use of in the Old Testament with respect to Jehovah is here applied by St. Peter to Christ, there could not be a clearer attestation to the deity of our Redeemer than that which is furnished by this passage as read in the Revised Version. And the necessity of the change here made in the text admits of no question. For the reading of the Authorised Version there are only a few manuscripts and Fathers; while for that of the Revised there are all the great Uncials, several of the Fathers, and all the best versions. This instance of clear gain by rectification of the text tends all the more to reconcile us to the apparent loss which now comes to be mentioned.

1 *John* v. 7, 8. The whole of these verses bearing upon what is known as “the heavenly witnesses,” has been omitted in the Revised Version. This omission is one of the most indubitable results of textual criticism. The words left out can be proved to have no claim whatever to a place in the text of Scripture. None of the Uncial manuscripts contain them. None of the ancient versions represent them. None of the Fathers quote them, even when arguing on the subject of the Trinity. There are, indeed, two passages in

Cyprian which seem to indicate an acquaintance with verse 7, but even though that be granted, the fact goes for nothing against such powerful counter-evidence. As was formerly noticed, Erasmus omitted the words in his first two editions. But, as they had long stood in the Vulgate, he was, of course, subjected to much odium for so doing. To disarm his malignant assailants, he promised that in future editions he would insert the words if they were found in a single Greek manuscript. One *was* discovered in Britain which did contain them, and therefore Erasmus admitted them into the text of his third edition. But it is now agreed by all scholars that the “British manuscript,” on whose authority the words were inserted, was not more ancient than the fifteenth or sixteenth century. It once belonged to a Dr. Montfort, of Cambridge, and from him it has derived its name, being still preserved under the title of the *Codex Montfortianus* in Trinity College, Dublin. Erasmus himself suspected that the disputed words contained in this manuscript had been translated into Greek from the Latin Vulgate, and this is now the fixed opinion of critics. The same thing must be said respecting the only other Greek manuscript known to contain the passage. It belongs to the fifteenth century, and is preserved in the Vatican library. The text it offers varies considerably in the verses referred to from that of the manuscript

already spoken of, but was also undoubtedly derived from the Latin. The same seems clearly to have been the case with the Complutensian edition of the New Testament. That contained in Greek the disputed words, and Stunica, its leading editor, severely censured Erasmus for omitting them. But when the great scholar asked him to state on what authority he had inserted the passage in the text, Stunica appealed only to the Vulgate. He maintained that the Latin represented the true original of Scripture, and that the Greek copies had been corrupted, a pretty conclusive proof that the words in question owed their place in his text not to their having been found in any Greek manuscripts, but simply to their having been translated into Greek from the Vulgate.

No defender of the genuineness of 1 John 7, 8, will probably arise in the future. The controversy regarding the passage is finished, and will never be renewed. But the literary history to which it has given rise will not be forgotten. A small library might be formed of the books and pamphlets which have been written for or against the words. Among the authors of these works some very celebrated names appear. That of the illustrious Sir Isaac Newton has a place in the list. He wrote against the genuineness of the words, and thus did good service in the cause of truth. But by far the most memorable event in this lengthened

and often bitter controversy was the publication of the letters of Professor Porson to Archdeacon Travis. These letters, by their acuteness and ability, whatever may be thought of their spirit, virtually settled the case against the genuineness of the passage. And although since then the voices of some zealous friends of Scripture—Bishops, Cardinals, and others—have been unwisely lifted up in defence of “the three heavenly witnesses,” yet so decidedly have the minds of all scholars now been made up as to the spuriousness of the words, that they have been omitted in the Revised Version without a line even on the margin to indicate that they had ever been admitted to a place in the sacred text.

P A R T   I I.

---

C H A N G E S   A R I S I N G   F R O M   A N  
A M E N D E D   T R A N S L A T I O N.



## CHAPTER I.

### CORRECTION OF MISTAKES IN THE MEANING OF GREEK WORDS.

THERE are not very many instances in which the Authorised Version has positively mistaken the import of the original. The translators had before them the labours of many able predecessors, and upon the whole turned to good account the advantages which they thus enjoyed. Still, there are cases in which they have gone quite astray in the meaning assigned to the Greek, and to the chief of these we now proceed to direct our attention.

*Matt.* x. 4 and *Mark* iii. 18. In these passages we read in the Authorised Version of “Simon the Canaanite.” This naturally suggests to an English reader the idea that one of the Apostles did not belong to the family of Abraham, but to the race of the Canaanites. Such a notion, however, rests upon an utter mistake. The epithet applied to Simon is taken from the Aramaic *patois*, then commonly spoken in Palestine. It is replaced by the Greek word

meaning "Zealot" at Luke vi. 15 and Acts i. 13, just as the same Evangelist gives the Greek equivalent at Luke viii. 54 for the Aramaic words in Mark v. 41. The meaning, therefore, is that Simon had, before he became a follower of Christ, belonged to the Jewish faction of the Zealots. Accordingly, this explanation has been given on the margin of the Revised Version at Matt. x. 4, and Mark iii. 18, while *Cananaean* has taken the place of the erroneous and misleading form "Canaanite," in the text.

*Matt.* xiv. 8. Here we read in the Authorised Version, "*She, being before instructed of her mother,*" &c. But it is certain that this is a mistake. The Greek verb made use of has never any reference to time, but can only mean "urged on," or "impelled." As Archbishop Trench has remarked, "We may conceive the unhappy girl, with all her vanity and levity, yet shrinking from the petition of blood which her mother would put into her lips, and needing to be urged on or pushed forward before she could be induced to make it; and this is implied in the word."<sup>\*</sup> Hence the rendering "put forward" in the Revised Version.

*Matt.* xv. 27. The Greek will not here allow of the rendering "yet," which occurs in the Authorised Version. And it completely perverts the meaning.

\* *On Authorised Version, p. 115.*

The argument of the woman is derived from that very appellation which our Lord had given her. Granting its truthfulness, she saw it opened a door of hope before her, so that, instead of being driven by Christ's words to despair, she ventured to rest her whole case upon them, and exclaimed, as in the Revised Version, “Yea, Lord, *for even* the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their master's table.”

*Matt. xxvi. 15.* An interesting correction has been made in this verse. We cannot, indeed, affirm that the translation “covenanted,” here found in the Authorised Version, is absolutely impossible. But it entirely breaks the connection between this passage and Zech. xi. 12. We there find the very same Greek verb in the Septuagint as here occurs in the Gospel. The Old Testament rendering is, “They *weighed* for my price thirty pieces of silver.” And so it should be here, as in the Revised Version, “They weighed unto him thirty pieces of silver.”

*Mark iv. 29.* Here the expression “is brought forth,” in the Authorised Version, is a very inexact rendering of the Greek verb. The proper translation, “is ripe,” will be found in the text of the Revised Version.

*Luke iii. 23.* Here we find in the Authorised Version the singular statement that “Jesus himself

began to be about thirty years of age." The Greek gives no countenance to such a translation. It ought to be rendered as in the Revised Version, "And Jesus himself, when he began (to teach), was about thirty years of age."

*Luke ix. 32.* This verse is quite misrepresented by the Authorised Version, "But Peter, and they that were with him, were heavy with sleep ; and *when they were awake*, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him." It ought to be rendered as in the Revised Version, "But Peter, and they that were with him, were heavy with sleep ; *yet having remained awake*, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him."

*Luke xviii. 12.* Here the word "possess" in the Authorised Version is quite an impossible rendering of the Greek. It ought to be "acquire" or "get," as in the Revised Version. Tithes were paid not on what was laid up or *possessed*, but on what was gained in the way of increase. Hence the Pharisee says, "I give tithes of all that I get."

*Luke xxii. 56.* The exact and graphic force of the original is here missed in the Authorised Version. "But a certain maid beheld him as he sat by the fire : and earnestly looked upon him, and said, This man was also with him." The real meaning is, **t**hat she recognised him when a flash of the smouldering fire

fell upon his countenance. This is brought out in the Revised Version. “And a certain maid seeing him as he sat in the light (of the fire), and earnestly looking upon him, said, This man also was with him.”

*Luke xxiv. 25.* Many readers must have been struck by the harshness of the words, “O fools,” here found in the Authorised Version. Such an opening of his discourse seems quite out of keeping with the tender and affectionate way in which Christ dealt with these two disciples. No such incongruity appears in the original. It simply denotes want of understanding and reflection, and the Authorised Version has been softened in the Revised by the simple emendation, “O foolish men.”

*John ix. 17.* Here the Authorised Version is scarcely intelligible. “They say unto the blind man again, What sayest thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes?” The meaning is made plain in the Revised Version merely by inserting “in,” thus—“They say therefore unto the blind man again, What sayest thou of him, in that he opened thine eyes? And he said, He is a prophet.”

*John x. 14, 15.* The connection between these two verses is totally destroyed in the Authorised Version, which runs thus : “I am the good Shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. As the

Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep." The verses should be read as in the Revised Version: "I am the good Shepherd, and I know mine own, and mine own know me, even as the Father knoweth me and I know the Father; and I lay down my life for the sheep."

*John xi. 20.* The supplementary word "still" here inserted in the Authorised Version: "but Mary sat still in the house," is apt to produce an erroneous impression. By simply transposing it in the Revised Version, the true meaning of the tense employed in the original is brought out: "but Mary still sat in the house."

*Acts ii. 3.* The Authorised Version is here quite wrong: "And there appeared unto them *cloven tongues*, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them." The symbolical meaning of the appearance is thus quite missed. We must render, as in the Revised Version, "And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder (or, *parting among them*), like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them."

*Acts iii. 19, 20.* An impossible translation here occurs in the Authorised Version, in which we read: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, *when the times of refreshing shall come* from the presence of the Lord; and he

*shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you.*" For eschatological reasons it is most important that the true rendering of this passage should be presented. It is thus given in the Revised Version: "Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, *that so seasons of refreshing may come* from the presence of the Lord; and *that he may send* the Christ who hath been appointed for you (even), Jesus."

*Acts xxvi. 28.* It is with some reluctance that we here abandon the rendering of the Authorised Version, "*Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.*" This is a text from which many eloquent and edifying sermons have been preached, but the Greek will not tolerate it. Quite a different expression must have been used for "almost;" and the true rendering of the original, as it stands, seems to be that of the Revised Version: "With *but little persuasion* thou wouldest fain make me a Christian."

*Rom. iii. 25.* The Authorised translation of this verse is, "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." But, besides being almost unintelligible, this is an utterly impossible version of the Greek. The original can only be fairly represented in some such translation as that of the Revised

Version : “Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by his blood, to shew his righteousness, *because of the passing over of the sins* done aforetime, in the forbearance of God.”

*Rom.* xi. 7, 25. It is remarkable that the Greek words which the Authorised Version translates in these verses, and at *2 Cor.* iii. 14, *Eph.* iv. 18, as “blinded” and “blindness,” are in the Gospels (*Mark* iii. 5, vi. 52; *John* xii. 40) rendered “hardened” and “hardness.” The latter is their proper meaning, and, as such, it has been consistently maintained in the Revised Version.

*1 Cor.* iv. 4. This verse stands as follows in the Authorised Version, “For I know nothing *by myself*; yet am I not hereby justified; but he that judgeth me is the Lord.” As thus translated, the passage is constantly misunderstood. Even intelligent readers imagine that the Apostle here means to state that he was dependent for all the knowledge he had on the favour of God. But this is a total misapprehension of the meaning. The true sense is brought out in the Revised Version, “For I know nothing *against myself*; yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord.” This passage might, perhaps, have been more justly classed with those archaisms which require adjustment to present-day usage than with mistakes in translation. Yet the misunderstanding of the words

is so great, that it seemed important to notice them here. Some have deemed the expression “by myself” a mere provincialism, which was, through oversight, admitted into the Authorised Version, but the phrase seems once to have been good English. Thus, “Cranmer says to Henry VIII., ‘I am exceedingly sorry that such faults can be proved *by* the queen,’ that is, against her.”\* The Apostle means that though he was not conscious of having done any wrong in reference to the Corinthians, yet, after all, it was only God that could truly judge and thoroughly justify him.

2 *Cor.* ii. 14. Here the rendering, “Now thanks be unto God, which always *causeth us to triumph* in Christ,” seems to rest on a mistake as to the meaning of the Greek. Indeed, the Authorised Version contradicts itself, for the same word occurs again at *Col.* ii. 15, and is there translated “triumphing over them.” The correct rendering is that of the Revised Version, “But thanks be unto God, which always *leadeth us in triumph* in Christ,” on which Bishop Lightfoot remarks, that here “the image of the believer made captive and chained to the car of Christ is most expressive, while the paradox of the Apostle’s thanksgiving over his own spiritual defeat and thraldom is at once significant and characteristic.”†

\* Eadie, *The English Bible*, ii. 374.

† *Revision of the New Testament*, p. 135.

*Gal. v. 17.* The Authorised Version here reads, “For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh ; and these are contrary the one to the other ; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.” By this rendering the *flesh* is represented as the master-principle, which succeeds in preventing believers from doing the things which they would. But the very opposite is implied in the Greek. The Spirit who dwells in believers is represented as enabling them successfully to resist those tendencies to evil which naturally exist within them ; and the correct rendering is that of the Revised Version, “For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh ; for these are contrary the one to the other ; *that ye may not do the things that ye would.*”

*Eph. iv. 29.* Here again the Authorised Version presents the following impossible translation, “Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good *to the use of edifying*, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.” The literal meaning of the Greek is “to the building up of the need,” and its real import is, that hearers are to be addressed, not in commonplace generalities, but in special terms, as their necessities require. This is expressed in the Revised Version, “Let no corrupt speech proceed out of your mouth, but that which is

*good for edifying as the need may be, that it may give grace to them that hear."*

*Philipp.* iv. 2, 3. The Authorised Version here reads, "I beseech Euodias, and beseech Syntyche, that they be of the same mind in the Lord. And I intreat thee also, true yoke-fellow, help those women which laboured with me in the Gospel," &c. It would seem from this rendering that Euodias and Syntyche are referred to only in the second verse, and that the *women* afterwards spoken of are different. But the original shows that this is not the case, and the proper translation is that of the Revised Version, "I beseech Euodias, and I beseech Syntyche to be of the same mind in the Lord. Yea, I intreat thee also, true yoke-fellow, help *those women* for they laboured with me in the Gospel," &c.

*Col.* ii. 8. If it cannot be said that the Authorised Version here is positively erroneous, it is certainly liable to grave misconstruction. The true meaning is clearly brought out, when instead of "Beware lest any man *spoil* you through philosophy and vain deceit," we read as in the Revised Version, "Take heed lest there shall be any one that maketh spoil of you through his philosophy and vain deceit."

*2 Thess.* ii. 1. Here the Authorised Version errs, in common with many others, in the rendering, "Now we beseech you, brethren, by *the coming*

of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. It should be, as in the Revised Version, "Now we beseech you, brethren, *in regard of the coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ," &c.

*1 Tim.* vi. 5. Here the rendering of the Authorised Version, "supposing that gain is godliness," is not only erroneous but absurd. How it could have ever found acceptance is very difficult to understand. As the original clearly indicates, "godliness" is the subject, and "gain" the predicate, so that the correct rendering is that of the Revised Version, "supposing that godliness is *a way of gain*."

*Heb.* xi. 13. This verse is spoiled in the Authorised Version, which runs thus, "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." It was formerly remarked that the clause "and were persuaded of them" has no right to stand in the text. We have now to notice that the translation, "and *embraced* them," is incorrect. The image, as Chrysostom long ago remarked, is that of sailors who, catching a glimpse of the shores they wish to reach, salute them from a distance. It will be remembered how the poet notices this in our own language, when, speaking of a promontory by the sea, he says—

“ His hoary head  
Conspicuous many a league, the mariner,  
Bound homeward, and in hope already there,  
*Greets with three cheers exulting.*” \*

Such is the attitude assigned in this passage to the Old Testament saints, and the verse ought to be translated as in the Revised Version, “These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them, and *greeted them from afar*, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.”

**I Pet.** iii. 21. It is certain that the Authorised Version is here wrong in translating the original as meaning “the *answer* of a good conscience towards God.” The exact meaning of the clause is difficult to determine. It probably is *the seeking after God* with an earnest heart, as the great spiritual idea in Christian baptism implies. The Revised Version, with certainly a far nearer approach to truth than the Authorised, inserts somewhat doubtfully in the text, “the interro-  
gation of a good conscience toward God,” while “inquiry” and “appeal” stand on the margin.

**Rev.** iv. 6, 7, 8, 9; v. 6, 8, 11, 14; vi. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7;  
vii. 11; xiv. 3; xv. 7; xix. 4. Every one must have heard the word “beast” or “beasts,” which is the translation of the Authorised Version in these passages, quietly corrected into “living creature” or “creatures.”

\* Cowper’s *Task*, Book I.

The word in the original is totally different from that which is found in such passages as Rev. xiii. 1, xiv. 9, &c., where the rendering “beast” is quite proper. The terms will be found properly discriminated in the Revised Version.

## CHAPTER II.

## CORRECTION OF MISTAKES IN GREEK GRAMMAR.

HERE a very wide field opens up before us. The Authorised Version is often most inexact in regard to grammatical points. This comes out in many ways, and will here be illustrated with reference to the article, the tenses of the Greek verb, and the senses assigned to several prepositions.

It need hardly be said how great is the difference of meaning imparted to a clause or sentence in our language, according as one word in it is without an article, or has the indefinite or definite article. Thus, if we read, “God gave life to *man*,” that is felt to have a very distinct sense from “God gave life to *a man*,” and the latter again to be very different in meaning from, “God gave life to *the man*.” Perhaps no better illustration could be adduced of the difference of signification caused in English by the use of the indefinite or definite articles respectively than is furnished in the remark said to have been made by Charles Fox, when, comparing his own fluency with that of William Pitt, he said, “I never want *a* word,

but Pitt never wants *the* word." These examples will sufficiently suggest to the reader how much may depend on the correct use of the article in our language.

But in the Authorised Version this point of accuracy has been almost entirely neglected. The Greek language has a definite article, and its omission or insertion in a passage often has the weightiest effect upon the sense. Yet our translators seem to have been ignorant of this fact, and have treated the article as if it were not of the slightest importance. They have been guilty of every possible variety of error in connection with it. As will immediately appear, they have omitted it in their version where it existed in the original; they have inserted it where it had no place in the Greek; and they have sometimes over-translated it by giving it the force of a demonstrative pronoun. Let us look at some instances of their blundering under each of these three heads.

First—The Authorised Version has frequently *omitted* the article where it existed in the Greek. There are, no doubt, cases in which the English idiom will not tolerate the use of an article where it is found in the original. This is especially true when it stands before proper names and abstract nouns. But, with these exceptions, it is generally important that the definite article should be represented in English when

it stands in the Greek. This comes out very strikingly in connection with the word *Christ*. That term is never used in the Gospels as a proper name, but always as an official title. Only once is it connected with the personal appellation Jesus, namely, at John xvii. 3, in which passage the Saviour stations himself, as it were, in the future, when his claim to be regarded as Messiah shall have been demonstrated by the resurrection. After that event, the term *Christ* might be used as synonymous with *Jesus*, but not before. Accordingly, we find that in the Gospels the word has, with very few exceptions, the article prefixed, and should therefore be translated “*the Christ*.” Thus, at Matt. ii. 4, where the Authorised Version has “he demanded of them where *Christ* should be born,” the proper rendering is *the Christ*, the promised Messiah. And so throughout. Many other examples of the improper and hurtful omission of the article by the Authorised Version might be quoted. I shall notice only these two—2 Thess. ii. 3, where, instead of “*a* falling away,” and “*that* man of sin,” we should read “except *the* falling away come first, and *the* man of sin be revealed,” and Heb. xi. 10, where the right rendering is, “he looked for *the* city which hath *the* foundations,” the reference being to the well-known and often-alluded-to foundations, in other words, he looked for the New Jerusalem, of which it had been

already said, “Her *foundations* are in the holy mountains” (Ps. lxxxvii. 1; cf. Isa. xxviii. 16); even as in the Apocalypse great things are spoken of these glorious foundations of the heavenly city (Rev. xxi. 14, 19, 20).<sup>\*</sup> Proper regard to the insertion of the definite article where it occurs in the Greek will be found one of the marked characteristics of the Revised Version.

Secondly, the Authorised Version has *inserted* the definite article where it had no place in the Greek. This is not such a frequent error as that just noticed, but still not a few examples are to be found. Thus, at 1 Tim. vi. 10, the Authorised Version makes St. Paul declare that “the love of money is *the* root of all evil,” an exaggerated statement which could not be seriously maintained, whereas the true rendering is, “the love of money is *a* root of all evil,” a sad truth which universal experience has confirmed. So again, at Luke iii. 14, we should read, “and soldiers also asked him ;” at 2 Cor. iii. 15, “*a* veil lieth upon their heart ;” at Gal. iv. 31, “children of a handmaid ;” at Philipp. iii. 5, “a Hebrew of Hebrews ;” and thus in several other passages which will be noticed by readers of the Revised Version.

Thirdly, the Authorised Version has sometimes *over-translated* the article by giving it the force of a

\* Abp. Trench, *On the Authorised Version*, p. 86.

demonstrative pronoun. Examples of this error occur at John i. 21, where we find, “Art thou *that* prophet?” instead of “Art thou *the* prophet?” iv. 37, “*that* saying” for “*the* saying;” vi. 32, “*that* bread” for “*the* bread;” at Acts xix. 9, “*that* way” for “*the* way;” 2 Cor. iii. 17, “*that* Spirit” for “*the* Spirit;” vii. 11, “in *this* matter” for “in *the* matter;” Rev. i. 3, “words of *this* prophecy” for “words of *the* prophecy;” and so in some other passages which have been corrected in the Revised Version.

Finally, in connection with this point there are several passages which serve to prove that the translators of the Authorised Version attached little or no importance to the occurrence of the article either in Greek or English. Thus, at James v. 20 they translated the Greek by “*a* multitude of sins,” while at 1 Peter iv. 8 they render the very same words “*the* multitude of sins.” Thus, too, at Matt. viii. 20 we find the article which stands in the original given in English, “*The* foxes have holes, and *the* birds of the air have nests,” whereas at Luke ix. 58 the very same Greek is rendered without the article—“Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests.” How detrimental to the bringing out of the true meaning of Scripture in many passages was this unscholarly and inconsistent treatment of the article has already been sufficiently evinced.

The next point of grammatical incorrectness which calls for notice in the Authorised Version respects the rendering of the tenses of the Greek verb. Here, as in regard to the article, the translators were, no doubt, misled by their greater familiarity with the Latin than the Greek language. The Latin has no article, definite or indefinite, nor does it possess the elaborate tense system of the Greek. In particular, Latin has no means of distinguishing between momentary past action for ever finished and continuous past action just completed, but which may still be carried on. The Latin perfect tense must serve both purposes, and hence it was natural that men who were accustomed to speak and write in that language, with its one tense denoting both varieties of past action, should fail to discriminate between the two tenses employed to express the two kinds of past action in the sister tongue.

We find, accordingly, that little attention is paid in the Authorised Version to the difference between the Greek aorist and the Greek perfect. They are interchanged very much at random in the translation. Thus, at Matt. ii. 2 an aorist is translated as a perfect—"we have seen" for "we saw;" while at Luke xiii. 2 a perfect is translated as an aorist—"they suffered" for "they have suffered." The clear principle which ought to be observed in regard to this matter is that

the Greek tenses should always be rendered with strict grammatical precision in English, whenever the genius of our language will admit of it. But there are, undoubtedly, many occasions on which English idiom will not tolerate a strict rendering of the aorist. Instead of the bare and hard past tense, a perfect or even pluperfect rendering brings out the meaning better in our language. Thus at Matt. xix. 20 an aorist occurs in the Greek, yet the Revised Version, no less than the Authorised, renders it by a perfect—“All these things *have I observed.*” It is quite impossible to act upon the rule that the Greek aorist must always be rendered by the English past tense; and, that being so, differences of opinion will necessarily arise with respect to particular passages. But, while this is admitted, there is at the same time no doubt that the strict grammatical meaning of the tense has often been departed from in the Authorised Version, not only without necessity, but even to the detriment of the sense. Thus, at Matt. ii. 15, instead of “I have called,” we ought to read “I called,” the reference being to a historic fact in the distant past. So at Acts xix. 2 the meaning is quite obscured by the rendering—“Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?” It ought to be, “Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?” Once more, at 2 Pet. i. 14 the striking reference by the Apostle to

the scene described in John xxi. 18, 19, is quite lost by the substitution of a perfect tense for the aorist of the original. The verse has only to be read as it stands in the Authorised and Revised Versions respectively to feel that such is the case. In the one we find the following words : “Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ *hath shewed* me,” as if the communication had just been made. In the other we read, “Knowing that the putting off of my tabernacle cometh swiftly, even as our Lord Jesus Christ *shewed* me”—the mind being thus at once transported to the shore of the Lake of Galilee, where Christ had so long ago forewarned his Apostle “by what manner of death he should glorify God.” These are only a few examples of the many grammatical corrections which have been made with respect to the aorist in the Revised Version.

Again, as has been said, perfects are translated as if they had been aorists. This also sometimes greatly mars the sense, as at 1 Cor. xv. 4. In the first clause of that verse an aorist occurs, and in the second a perfect ; but both are translated as past tenses in the Authorised Version, thus, “And that he was buried, and that he *rose again* the third day according to the Scriptures.” The beautiful discrimination indicated in the original between the fact of Christ’s burial and that

of his resurrection is thus lost. The former event was simply historical, and has passed away for ever; the latter is more than historical, for Christ still exists as a living Person who *has risen* again from the dead. The perfect, therefore, should have its proper meaning assigned to it, and the verse should stand thus, "And that he *was* buried, and that he *hath been raised* on the third day according to the Scriptures." There are numerous other instances in which the use of the perfect in the Greek has a special beauty which is lost in our English version. Thus, the proper rendering at John v. 33 imparts great additional vividness to the passage—"Ye *have sent* unto John, and he *hath borne* witness unto the truth." Of course, the perfect may frequently be expressed by "is" as well as by "has;" we may say either "my time *is* not yet come," or, "my time *has* not yet come." Sometimes the one form is to be preferred in our language and sometimes the other; but in one way or another, the perfect, where it occurs in the Greek, may generally be expressed in English. Thus we read at Matt. xxv. 6, "At midnight a cry *is* made," and not "*was* made;" at John viii. 33, "*have* never *been*," and not "*were* never," and so in other places which will be observed in reading the Revised Version.

The imperfect tense often expresses delicate shades of meaning in the original which cannot always be

represented in our language. But certainly much more may in this respect be accomplished than is attempted in the Authorised Version. Thus at Matt. iii. 14, the word “forbad” is a very coarse rendering of an imperfect tense in the Greek. The meaning is that John laboured for a time to avoid what he thought the unseemliness of baptising his superior, and this has been expressed in the Revised Version by the words, “John *would have hindered* him.” Again, at Luke i. 59, there is a mis-statement of fact owing to the neglect of the imperfect tense. It is stated that “they *called* him Zacharias,” but this is not true, since they were prevented by the interposition of his mother from doing so. The passage simply implies that they *intended* to name the child Zacharias, and this is expressed by the translation, “they *would have called* him.” Once more, at Luke v. 6, we read in the Authorised Version that “their net *brake*,” where the proper rendering is “*was breaking*”—the process had begun. Sometimes the aorist and the imperfect stand in the same verse, and the force of the latter is then very obvious, yet has not unfrequently been missed. Thus at Luke viii. 23 we read that “there came down a storm of wind on the lake, and they *were filled* with water, and were in jeopardy;” but while the tense of the first verb denotes completed past action, that of the second implies that the threatened result was not

yet accomplished, and the translation should be “they *were filling* with water.”

The manner in which the Greek tenses are rendered in the Authorised Version does indeed exhibit strange inconsistency and confusion. Present tenses are represented by *pasts*, as at Heb. ix. 6, “the priests *went*,” for “the priests *go*,” at Rev. vii. 14, “these are they which *came*,” for “these are they which *come*,” and in other places; and by *futures*, as at Matt. xxiv. 40 and 41, “the one *shall be* taken, and the other left,” for “one *is* taken, and one *is* left;” John vii. 41, “*Shall* Christ come out of Galilee?” for “*Doth* the Christ come out of Galilee?” and in several other passages. Future tenses are rendered as *imperatives*: thus, at Matt. v. 48, we find, “*Be ye* perfect,” for “Ye *shall be* perfect, and at 1 Tim. vi. 8, we read, much to the injury of the passage, “Having food and raiment *let us be* therewith content,” for “*we shall be* therewith content.”

While the Authorised Version is thus so very inexact in its rendering of the tenses, we cannot expect to find it free from error in various other particulars connected with the Greek verb. Some writers have, accordingly, noted that it occasionally mis-translates the middle or passive voice, by assigning it a meaning which belongs only to the active. Thus, at Philipp. ii. 15, we find “among whom *ye shine*,” where the correct

rendering is, “among whom ye *are seen*.” Again at 2 Cor. v. 10, the force of the passive is not brought out. The original implies far more than that “we must all *appear* before the judgment seat of Christ,” its real force is that “we must all *be made manifest*.” When the ear has once become disenchanted of the charm which is felt to reside in the familiar words of the Authorised Version, it will be acknowledged that in the changes which regard for grammatical accuracy in rendering the Greek verb has demanded, much gain is to be derived from the more scholarly representation of the original presented in the Revised Version.

We have now to look at some of those instances of mistranslation which occur in the Authorised Version with respect to the Greek prepositions. These errors are not so numerous as some writers have represented. It would be an utter mistake to demand from the writers of that Hebraised Greek in which the New Testament is composed the same grammatical precision that is found in the classical authors. There should be taken into account, when dealing especially with their use of the Greek prepositions, the fact that they were influenced by the analogous Hebrew words in the way in which they employed them. We cannot, therefore, rigidly apply

to their writings those canons of interpretation derived from a study of the classics. Much allowance must be made for the effect of Hebrew idiom ; but, after that has been done, it is certain that the sacred writers did not use the prepositions with that laxity which might be inferred from the renderings given to them in the Authorised Version.

We cannot, for example, imagine that they confounded the two very distinct meanings which a much-used preposition\* had, according as it governed the genitive or accusative. Yet this is frequently done in our English version. The genitive rendering “*by means of*” is substituted for the accusative rendering “*by reason of*,” or the preposition is, in some other way, deflected from its proper import. Thus, at John vi. 57, we find the erroneous rendering “*by*” twice in one verse, “As the living Father hath sent me and I live *by* the Father ; so he that eateth me, even he shall live *by* me.” The great theological truth is thus obscured that the Father is the fountain of life, while the Son again is the source of all life to created beings, and specially of the highest life to His people ; and the verse should be rendered as follows, “As the living Father sent me, and I live *because of* the Father ; so he that eateth me shall live *because of* me.” At Heb. vi. 7 we read “bringeth forth herbs meet for

\* διδ.

them *by* whom it is dressed," instead of the only correct rendering "*for whose sake* it is dressed." Numerous other examples of the way in which the two perfectly distinct meanings of the preposition, according to the case by which it is followed, are confounded, might be produced, but that is not the only error which our translators have committed in respect to it. They have rendered it "at" in Matt. vii. 13, where the usual "by" would have been more correct; "for" at 1 Cor. vii. 26, where "by reason of" is the clearer translation; "for" again at Rom. xv. 30, where, with a different case, "by" is the only proper equivalent; and even "to" instead of "by" at 2 Pet. i. 3, where they must have been in despair as to the meaning before they adopted such an impossible translation. They clearly show that they had no principles to guide them in the rendering they gave of this preposition, sometimes placing the wrong translation in the text and the right one in the margin, or *vice versâ*, and being apparently induced to choose one English term rather than another, simply by what seemed to them best to suit the context.

Not to dwell at any length on mis-translations of other prepositions, the following erroneous renderings may simply be noted as specimens. At Luke xxiii. 42 we have the very serious mistake of "Lord, re-

member me when thou comest *into* thy kingdom," for "Lord, remember me when thou comest *in* thy kingdom"—in the full possession of Thy mediatorial sovereignty. At Matt. xxviii. 19, instead of "baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," the true rendering is "baptizing them *into* the name," just as at 1 Cor. x. 2 we read "baptized *into* Moses," and as should be read at Acts viii. 16, "*into* the name of the Lord Jesus," and at 1 Cor. i. 13, "*into* the name of Paul." At Matt. xxiv. 30 the translation should be "*on* the clouds," and not "*in* the clouds;" and so in other passages where the same preposition is used. In the important doctrinal passage, 1 Cor. viii. 6, instead of "*in* him," we should read "*unto* him;" and the verse runs thus in the Revised Version : "To us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him ; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him."

It deserves also to be noticed that prepositions are sometimes mis-translated when in composition with verbs. Thus, to give only one striking example, we read in the Authorised Version, at Heb. iv. 14, "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed *into* the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession." But this is an impossible translation of the preposition here used with

the verb, and the only correct rendering is, “Having then a great high priest, who hath passed *through* the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession.” This expression, “hath passed through the heavens,” may at first appear strange to us, but it will gain in significance the more it is pondered, denoting, as it probably does, that “as the earthly high priest passed through the veil into the holiest place, so the great High Priest *through* the heavens to God’s throne.”\*

Many other examples of less or more inaccuracy might be noticed as existing in our common English translation, but the above must suffice as illustrations ; and the rest will suggest themselves to every careful reader of the Revised Version.

\* Alford on *Heb.* iv. 14.

### CHAPTER III.

#### CORRECTION OF ARCHAISMS, AMBIGUITIES, AND THE RENDERING OF PROPER NAMES AND TECHNICAL EXPRESSIONS.

No attempt has been made to modernise the style of the Authorised Version. On the contrary, “innocent archaisms”—to use an expression which was frequently on the lips of the Company—have invariably been allowed to stand. It was felt that these tend to give a dignity and solemnity to a translation of the Scriptures, and that to change them into the language of present every-day life would have been to ensure loss instead of gain. As has been well remarked, “These (archaisms), shedding round the sacred volume the reverence of age, removing it from the ignoble associations which will often cleave to the language of the day, should on no account be touched, but rather thankfully accepted and carefully preserved. For, indeed, it is good that the phraseology of Scripture should not be exactly that of our common life: should be removed from the vulgarities, and even the familiarities, of this; just as there is a sense of fitness

which dictates that the architecture of a church should be different from that of a house.”\*

In accordance with these sentiments, the same antique air which belongs to the Authorised Version will be found also to distinguish the Revised Translation. Every archaism that still continues generally intelligible has been left untouched. Hence, such forms as *hath*, *whiles*, *throughly*, *holpen*, &c., have been retained, and the relative “which” has been allowed to stand, as in old English, when the antecedent is a person.

But it is manifest that an archaism ceases to be *innocent* when it has become altogether obsolete, or has wholly or to a considerable degree changed its meaning. And not a few such words or phrases are to be found in the Authorised Version. They are now either quite unintelligible or seriously misleading; and to substitute other expressions for them was clearly one of the plainest duties to be kept in view in preparing the Revised Version.

The following words may be given as examples of those that have, of necessity, been replaced by others. “Let” now means to *permit*, but is used with exactly the opposite meaning of *hinder* at Rom. i. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 7. “Worship” is now used only with reference to the service of God, but occurs in the

\* Abp. Trench *On the Authorised Version*, p. 22.

sense of *respect shown to man* at Luke xiv. 10; while “room,” now meaning *apartment*, is used in the same verse to denote a *seat*. “Wealth” reads strangely indeed at 1 Cor. x. 24, “Let no man seek his own, but every man another’s *wealth*,” where the word means *welfare*. “Prevent” now means to *hinder*, but at Matt. xvii. 25 and 1 Thess. iv. 15 it is used in the sense of *anticipate* or *precede*. “Quick” is used for *living*, as at Heb. iv. 12, and is barely intelligible to the ordinary reader of that passage. “Ensue” is quite obsolete in the sense of *pursue*, which it has at 1 Peter iii. 11. The word “conversation,” as used in the Authorised Version, is a most fruitful cause of mistake. It always means *conduct*, except at Philipp. iii. 20, where it is translated “citizenship” in the Revised Version, and might perhaps mean “city” or “home.” The dreadful word “damnation,” which stands at 1 Cor. xi. 29, has had the very worst consequences in many cases, and means no more than *judgment*. “Honest,” at Philip. iv. 8, is a Latinism, meaning *honourable*; and the same is true of Rom. xii. 17, though the Greek is there different. “Affect,” at Gal. iv. 17, is used for *court*, and “allow,” at Luke xi. 48, means *approve*—senses of the words which would never occur to a modern English reader. The words “offend” and “offence” are very misleading, but it is not easy to substitute for them others that

shall be in every respect preferable. The Revised Version has adopted *cause to stumble* and *stumbling-block* for “offend” and “offence” in some passages, as Matt. v. 29, xvi. 23, but in others has not been able to get rid of the obnoxious words. “Virtue,” at Mark v. 30 and Luke vi. 19, vii. 46, simply means *power*. In the word “usury,” at Matt. xxv. 27, there is no objectionable meaning, and it has been replaced by *interest*, as our language now requires. “Nephews,” at 1 Tim. v. 4, really means *grandchildren*; and when Moses is called “a proper child,” at Heb. xi. 23, the meaning is what we now express by such a word as *goodly*. The singular expression “occupy,” found at Luke xix. 13 means *traffic*, and “by-and-by,” which occurs at Matt. xiii. 21 and several other passages in the Gospels, means *immediately*. “Writing table,” at Luke i. 63, denotes *writing tablet*, while “devotions,” at Acts xvii. 23, means “objects of worship.” To mention only one other example of the many misleading archaisms which exist in the Authorised Version, the word “debate” is used at Rom. i. 29 in the sense of *strife*; and so liable is this to be misunderstood that we are told “a worthy member of a Scottish Church court once warned its members not to call their deliberations a ‘debate,’ for *debate* was one of the rank sins condemned by the inspired apostle! ”\*

\* Eadie’s *English Bible*, ii. 374.

As specimens of archaic phrases or modes of expression which are very apt at the present day to be mistaken the following will suffice. At Matt. vi. 34 the injunction, "Take no thought for the morrow," occurs, and has proved very hurtful in modern times. It was a faithful enough representation of the original two and a half centuries ago, for "thought" was then used in the sense of *anxiety*. But the word has now no such meaning, and the consequence is that the precept of our Lord as it stands has perplexed many a humble believer, while it has been used by unbelievers as a charge against Christ's teaching, which, they affirm, encourages *improvidence*. But the Greek really means, "Be not anxious for the morrow," and is so rendered in the Revised Version. Again, to take an instance of a different kind, what a ludicrous notion are these words at Acts xxi. 15 fitted to suggest: "And after those days we *took up our carriages*, and went up to Jerusalem." Persons of education will doubtless run little risk of mistaking the meaning of the passage. But it should ever be remembered that the Bible is, above all other volumes, *the people's book*, and that, if possible, not a single expression should be left in any translation of it which is at all likely to stumble or perplex the plainest reader. In the case before us, a very slight change, "we took up our *baggage*," makes the meaning clear. Some strange stories have been

told in connection with the words “we fetched a compass,” which occur at Acts xxviii. 13, and whether these be true or not, much is gained by the rendering, “we made a circuit,” adopted in the Revised Version.

Some ambiguities which occur in the Authorised Version also deserve to be noticed. One of the most puzzling of these, if regard be had only to the apparently grammatical import of the words, occurs at 2 Cor. v. 21, “He hath made him to be sin for *us*, *who knew no sin*,” where it might seem that the sinlessness of mankind was proclaimed. This possible misconception is very simply but effectually obviated in the Revised Version, by rendering, in exact accordance with the order of the Greek, “Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf.” At Luke iv. 20 the statement “He closed the book, and he gave it again to the *minister*” might suggest the idea of a president or preacher in the synagogue, instead of the *attendant* or officer who had charge of the sacred books. At Eph. vi. 12 the rendering, “spiritual wickedness in *high* places,” is clearly ambiguous, as it might seem to refer (and has, indeed, been so taken) to the wickedness of persons high in rank or authority, whereas the true meaning is “in the *heavenly* places,” as in other passages of the Epistle. There is an obvious misplacement of the word “also” at Heb. xii. 1, to the obscuring of the sense: “Wherefore

seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside," &c., as if the believers named in the previous chapter were, like us, "compassed about," while they, in fact, are themselves "the cloud of witnesses ;" and the verse should run, "Let us also," &c. Finally, James ii. 1, "My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ," is rendered clearer by translating "*hold not*," &c. ; and so at chap. iii. 1, "My brethren, be not many masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation," has, with advantage, been exchanged for, "Be not many *teachers*, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive a greater judgment," in the Revised Version.

We now proceed to consider the rendering of *proper names*.

The common-sense principle to be observed in regard to these is that one form should be preserved throughout Scripture for the same person, so that there may be no doubt as to identity. But, as need hardly be said, this rule is grossly violated in the Authorised Version. We find such varieties as Noah and Noe, Korah and Core, Hosea and Osee, Sinai and Sina, Midian and Madian, Miletus and Miletum, &c., made use of in referring to the same persons or places. This is most confusing to the reader, and may sometimes entail serious disadvantage. "Let us just seek," it

has been well said, “to realise to ourselves the difference in the amount of awakened attention among a country congregation which Matt. xvii. 10 would create if it were read thus : ‘ And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that *Elijah* must first come ? ’ as compared with what it now is likely to create.”\* The procedure of our translators in regard to this matter of proper names is truly incomprehensible. Not only do they vary the forms in the Old and New Testament, but they do so in the New Testament itself, even in the same books, yea, in the same chapters. Thus we find “Mark” at Acts xii. 12, 25 and 2 Tim. iv. 11, but “Marcus” at Col. iv. 10, Philem. ver. 24, 1 Peter v. 13 ; “Cretes” at Acts ii. 11, but “Cretians” at Tit. i. 12 ; “Simon, son of Jona,” at John i. 42, but “Simon, son of Jonas,” at John xxi. 15, 16, 17 ; “Luke” at Col. iv. 14, 2 Tim. iv. 11, but “Lucas” at Philem. ver. 24 ; “Jeremy” at Matt. ii. 17, but “Jeremias” at Matt. xvi. 14, and “Jeremy” again at Matt. xxvii. 9 ; “Timotheus” at Acts xvi. 1, but “Timothy” at Heb. xiii. 21, and, most strange of all, “Timothy” at 2 Cor. i. 1, but “Timotheus,” at ver. 19 of the same chapter. It is no slight gain that these and similar inconsistencies have been corrected in the Revised Version.

But there is another name which here calls for

\* Trench *On the Authorised Version*, p. 41.

special notice—even the “name that is above every name.” The Greek form of Joshua is Jesus, and for that very insufficient reason *Jesus* stands in two passages of the Authorised Version where *Joshua*, the leader of Israel, is intended. These are Acts vii. 45 and Heb. iv. 8, and in both passages the introduction of the name of Jesus must have proved very puzzling to plain English readers. When they find it stated that “if Jesus had given them rest, then would he (David) not afterwards have spoken of another day,” their minds are certain to form some confused notion of the Saviour, who is the author of rest to His people. And thus is a passage of Scripture obscured and perverted by the use of the name Jesus, instead of Joshua, to designate the illustrious captain of the children of Israel.

The extraordinary inconsistency of the Authorised Version in regard to proper names admits of still further illustration. At Acts xvii. 19 we find the term “Areopagus,” but only three verses after the same spot is referred to as “Mars’ hill ;” the form “Judea” occurs at Matt. ii. 1, and most other places, but for some inconceivable reason the name appears as “Jewry” at Luke xxiii. 5 and John vii. 1 ; so, again, “Judas” is the usual form in the New Testament for the “Judah” of the Old, but the name appears as “Juda” at Mark vi. 3, &c., and as “Jude” in the first

verse of the Epistle written by that Apostle. It is hardly possible to say a word in defence of such capricious variations, and, as a matter of course, they are not to be found in the Revised Version.

With regard to all such names, the really important points are that the form which has through circumstances become most familiar should be adopted, and that then this form should be adhered to with strict, unvarying consistency.

On now turning to the consideration of technical expressions, we find much to object to in the Authorised Version. Several, indeed, of the renderings it has given of them involve more or less of positive error. Thus is it with the term “deputy,” which occurs at Acts xiii. 7, 8, 12, and xix. 38; it should always be translated “proconsul.” Again, the rendering “certain of the chief of Asia,” at Acts xix. 31, suggests quite a false impression. It is an official title, and should have either been transferred from the Greek, like “tetrarch,” so as to read “Asiarchs,” or translated “presidents,” as in the Revised Version. At Mark vi. 27 the word rendered “executioner” really signifies “a soldier of the guard;” and at Rom. xvi. 23 “treasurer of the city” is a preferable rendering to “chamberlain”

It is very difficult to decide what course should be

followed in translating the names of coins, weights and measures. As need hardly be said, there are, as regards these, no words in our language exactly corresponding to the original; and it would never do to present them in a strictly equivalent version, so as to read “a measure of wheat for eightpence-half-penny,” or “six pounds five shillings would not purchase bread sufficient.” On the other hand, every one feels that the “penny” and “pence” which occur so often in the Authorised Version are awkward and misleading. Still, nothing better could be found. The word in the original, “denarion,” might indeed have been transferred from the Greek into English, and so with all the other terms in question. But this would have been felt almost intolerable, and such words could have conveyed no meaning to the English reader. For the most part, therefore, they have been left unaltered in the Revised Version. But in some passages greater definiteness has been given to the translation. Thus at Matt. xvii. 24, instead of the general word “tribute,” there is read, “Doth not your master pay the *half-shekel*? ” And at ver. 27 of the same chapter, for the unmeaning “piece of money,” we read “the *shekel*,” which, being exactly double the amount mentioned before, throws light on the immediately following words of our Lord to St. Peter, “that take, and give unto them *for me and thee*.”

It may here simply be noted that the expression "Easter," which occurs once in the Authorised Version, is quite indefensible. Our translators struck it out from many other places in which it stood in the earlier English versions, and it was probably retained at Acts xii. 4 by mere oversight. The word ought to be rendered there, as everywhere else, "passover."

There is one word not occurring at all in the Authorised Version that has simply been transplanted from Greek into English in the Revised Translation. This is the term "Hades," denoting the invisible world. Immense gain has been secured in several passages by the adoption of this word. Thus is it very markedly at Acts ii. 27, where these words are quoted from Ps. xvi. in reference to Christ : "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt thou give thy Holy One to see corruption." The common rendering "hell" is here wholly unsuitable. That word has in the Revised Version been reserved for a totally different term (*Gehenna*) in the original.

Before concluding this chapter, I may notice the correction of an error in the Authorised Version which seems to have been due at first simply to a misprint. It occurs at Matt. xxiii. 24: "Ye blind guides, which strain *at* a gnat, and swallow a camel." The correct rendering is "*strain out*," and so, doubtless, the translators intended their text to be, but in some way or

other, *at* instead of *out* found a place in the verse. We are told by scholars who have carefully examined the first edition of the Authorised Version, issued in 1611, that it is by no means correctly printed. The errors which it contained have been gradually removed in subsequent editions, so that the text is now very accurate ; but strangely enough, while other mistakes have been perceived and corrected, this “strain at” for “strain out” has maintained its place down to the present day.

## CHAPTER IV.

CORRECTION OF THE UNNECESSARY CONFOUNDING OF  
ONE GREEK WORD WITH ANOTHER IN TRANSLATION.

HERE it must at once be admitted that not a few distinctions which are well marked in the original cannot be exhibited in English. Strive as we may to the contrary, we are compelled to use the same word for different Greek expressions. This results from the comparative poverty of our tongue. It has been justly said that Greek can draw a clear line where other languages can only make a blot; and we must, therefore, as a matter of necessity, abandon in translation many of those fine distinctions which exist in the original.

It is, for instance, impossible to present in English the delicate shades of difference in meaning which appear in the Greek between the two\* verbs both rendered “love” at John xxi. 15—17. Yet the beauty of the passage is much impaired by the necessity which is felt in our language of translating the two words by one and the same in English. The word

\* ἀγαπῶ and φιλέω.

first employed by Christ is a very common one in the New Testament, and specially denotes a pure, spiritual affection. It is used of God's love to man, as at John iii. 16—"God so *loved* the world," &c.—and of man's love to God, as at Matt. xxii. 37—"Thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God," &c. The other word more particularly implies that warmth of feeling which exists between friends. Thus, it is used respecting Lazarus at John xi. 3 : "Behold, he whom thou *lovest* is sick;" and again, at John xx. 2, of St. John himself, when he is spoken of as "the disciple whom Jesus *loved*." Now, the use of the one word at first by Christ serves to remind St. Peter of the claim which his Divine Master had upon his deep, reverential love. But the Apostle, now profoundly sensible of his own weakness, does not venture to promise this, yet, feeling his whole heart flowing out to Christ, he makes use of the other word, and assures the Saviour at least of a fervent personal affection. Christ then repeats His question, still using the same verb, and Peter replies as before. But on asking the question for the third time, Christ graciously adopts the term employed by the Apostle: He speaks to him again as a friend; He clasps the now happy disciple afresh to His own loving heart. Now, all this we must, of necessity, lose through the meagreness of our language. In like manner, we miss the delicacy of the Greek in regard to the use of

the same two verbs at John xi. 3 and 5. And so is it in many other cases. When we observe that there are no fewer than *seven* Greek words which it has been found possible to translate as “child” in the Authorised Version, no fewer than *ten* which have been rendered “appoint,” no fewer than *fourteen* which stand for “give,” and no fewer than *twenty-one* which correspond to “depart,” enough has been said to suggest how frequently subtle distinctions which exist in the original must be lost in every English translation.

But this should only render the desire more earnest that where differences indicated in the Greek *can* be preserved in our language the opportunity should not be neglected. In many instances, indeed, there may not be much, if any, practical advantage resulting from such care in translation. Yet even then it is interesting and proper that distinctions observed in the original should, as far as possible, appear in the version. And, as will immediately be shown, it is sometimes most important, for the right understanding of passages, that distinctions should be clearly brought out which have been obliterated in the Authorised Version.

Let us look, for instance, at the two words\* both rendered “fold” in John x. 16, and observe how the

\* *αὐλὴ* and *ποίμνη*.

force of the passage comes out when they are distinguished, as they should be, in translation. The common Version runs thus: “And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold : them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice ; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.” But the Revised Version renders the last clause thus: “And they shall become one *flock*, one shepherd.” The Jewish Church constituted a special *fold*, with its strict enclosure, but our Lord’s words tell of the time when this exclusiveness should be done away, and when, instead of the narrowness of a *fold*, there should be the wide-spreading freedom of a *flock*, with one shepherd caring for them all.

An interesting distinction of gender which exists at John i. 11 should not have been suppressed under the rendering “his own,” adopted in both clauses of the verse. In the first clause the *neuter* plural is found, and in the second the *masculine*,\* a difference which has been indicated by this rendering in the Revised Version: “He came unto his own, and *they that were his own* received him not.”

Two different words † are, in common, translated “temple” in the Authorised Version, and in most passages their confusion is not of much consequence. But there is a clear difference of meaning between

\*  $\tauὰ ἴδια$  and  $οἱ ἴδιοι$ .

†  $\tauὸν ἱερόν$  and  $ὁ ναὸς$ .

them, and it is sometimes important that this should be brought out. The one is more general, embracing house and courts—the whole, indeed, of the sacred enclosure—and is consequently used in such passages as John x. 23, “Jesus *walked in the temple*,” and Acts v. 20, “Go, stand and *speak in the temple* to the people.” The other is more restricted, denoting the temple proper, the building or sanctuary, once called, at Luke xi. 51, “the house.” Now, unless these two meanings of the word “temple” be borne in mind, such a statement as that which occurs at Matt. xxiii. 35 will not be understood. Our Lord there speaks to His hearers of “the blood of Zacharias, whom ye slew *between the temple and the altar*.” In the wide sense of the word, the altar was within the temple, standing, as it did, in the court of the priests. But it is the more restricted term which is here used; and the reader will have no difficulty in understanding the passage when he reads it, as in the Revised Version, “whom ye slew *between the sanctuary and the altar*.”

At 1 Cor. xiv. 20 the force of the Apostle’s exhortation is weakened by two different words\* being both rendered “children.” The second expression is better rendered “babes;” and thus we learn how far St. Paul would have Christians go in their abnegation of all wickedness. “Be not children in mind,” he

\* μὴ παιδία γλυκεσθε and νηπιάζετε.

says : “howbeit in malice be ye *babes*,” guileless and innocuous as infants.

There are three words rendered “son” in the Authorised Version, but there is a cluster of passages on which it is important that one\* of these should rather be translated “servant.” This is the meaning sometimes properly assigned it, as at Matt. viii. 6, Luke xv. 26 ; but in the passages referred to—Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30—it is translated “son,” or “child.” But it is not to the sonship of Christ that these passages point. It is rather to the obedience which, as the servant of the Father, He rendered upon earth, and by bringing this out an important connection is established between the Old and New Testaments. As Archbishop Trench has remarked : “Every student of prophecy must have noticed how much there is in Isaiah prophesying of Christ under the aspect of ‘the *servant* of the Lord,’ ‘Israel my *servant*,’ ‘my *servant* whom I uphold’ (Isa. xlii. 1—7, xlix. 1—12, lvi. 13, liii. 12). But it is quite certain from the inner harmonies of the Old Testament and the New that wherever there is a large group of prophecies in the Old there is some allusion to them in the New.”† The Authorised Version does to some extent indicate the connection between fulfilment and prophecy in this matter by translating the word “servant” at Matt.

\* παῖς.

† *On the Authorised Version*, p. 68.

xii. 18, where Isa. xlii. 1 is quoted ; but the same rendering should have been adopted in the Acts, and this has been done in the Revised Version.

There are two words, both translated “repent,”\* in the Authorised Version which it is most desirable to distinguish wherever that is possible. The one word means simply to “rue” or “regret,” a course which has been followed ; the other implies that thorough change of mind which is implied in Christian repentance. Accordingly, the first term is applied, at Matt. xxvii. 3, to Judas, and denotes *remorse* rather than repentance ; while the second is constantly used in such passages as Luke xv. 10 : “There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that *repenteth*.” Unfortunately, it is not always possible to express the distinction in our language, but this has been done at 2 Cor. vii. 10, in the Revised Version, where “regret” has been introduced instead of “repent,” and the distinction has been made clear between the sorrow which is felt for having simply made a *mistake* and that which is experienced from a sense of *unworthiness and guilt*. In accordance with the difference of meaning thus indicated, it has been remarked that the second verb is frequently used in the imperative, the first never.

While the substantive for “unbelief” and the verb

\* μεταμέλομαι and μετανοεω.

for “to believe not” are always correctly rendered in the Authorised Version, there are two other related words \* sometimes confounded with these that should invariably be translated “disobedience” and “to obey not.” This is the rendering given at Eph. ii. 2, 1 Peter ii. 8, and other passages; but at Heb. iv. 6, Rom. xi. 30, &c., we find them translated “unbelief” and “believe not.” This inconsistency has been corrected throughout the Revised Version; and the point is of some importance, since *unbelief* and *disobedience* are not identical, but the one is the source of the other.

In one passage, John xiii. 10, the rendering of two different verbs † by the same English word has led to an almost complete obscuration of the sense. Let any one read the Authorised Version, “He that *is washed* needeth not save to *wash* his feet,” and scarcely any point will be seen in the words. But let him turn to the Revised Version, and read, “He that *is bathed* needeth not save to *wash* his feet,” and the force of our Lord’s statement will at once be apprehended. He will see that as, literally, the man who has been bathed needs only to wash his feet from the defilement which has been contracted since leaving the bath, so, spiritually, the believer in Christ, who has been cleansed from guilt by faith, needs not to have that process repeated, but simply requires, from day to

\* ἀπείθεια and ἀπειθέω.

† λελουμένος and νιψασθαι.

day, to be freed from the pollution which is contracted as he journeys through the world.

There are two nouns translated “knowledge,” and two related verbs translated “know,” \* which it is sometimes important to distinguish. The one form of the words is simple, the other is a compound with a preposition. The compound words denote full Christian knowledge. In one passage, 2 Cor. vi. 9, the Authorised Version acknowledges the intensified meaning given to the verb by the preposition: “as unknown, and yet *well known*;” but in other passages, as 1 Cor. xiii. 12, this is overlooked. We ought also to read at Eph. i. 17, as in the Revised Version, “the *full knowledge* of him,” as being the great object of the Apostle’s desire for those who already have come to a *saving knowledge* of the truth. In other passages the necessity for change is not so obvious.

Much obscurity results from the manner in which the word “will” is used in the Authorised Version. It is, of course, the sign of the English future, but besides that it does service as the representative of two different Greek verbs.† These verbs cannot always be distinguished in our language, but at least it may be made sure that they are not mistaken for the mere sign of the future. Thus the important text,

\* γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις; γνώσκω and ἐπιγινέσκω.

† θέλω and θούλουαι.

John vii. 17, becomes much clearer to the English reader when it is read, as in the Revised Version, “It any man *willeth to do* his will, he shall know of the teaching,” &c. So the meaning of 1 Tim. vi. 9 becomes more obvious when we read instead of “they that *will be rich*,” “they that *desire to be rich*.” Some other passages, as Matt. v. 40, are made clearer by the use of “would” instead of “will.” See again Acts xxii. 28, &c.

The word\* most frequently rendered “miracle,” or “miracles,” occurs seventeen times in St. John’s Gospel, thirteen times in St. Matthew, eleven times in St. Luke, and seven times in St. Mark. Now, it is a curious fact that, while this word is rendered “miracle,” or “miracles,” *thirteen* times in St. John’s Gospel, that rendering is not once given it in the other Gospels, except at Luke xxiii. 8. In every other passage it is translated *sign*, or *signs*; and such is the rendering which should have been preserved throughout. The word† which properly means “miracles,” *i.e.*, marvellous works, occurs but three times in the Gospels—Matt. xxiv. 24, Mark xiii. 32, John iv. 48—and *never* with reference to the works which Christ performed. It is, therefore, to be regretted that a word which simply suggests what is strange or wonderful should have such prominence

\* σημεῖον.

† τέρας.

assigned to it in connection with the works of Christ. These were “signs” rather than “miracles”—signs of the Divine presence fitted to impress the hearts of men, and not thaumaturgic acts which might excite only marvelling or admiration. The other word\* sometimes translated “miracle,” as at Mark ix. 39, does not occur in St. John’s Gospel at all. It is usually rendered “mighty work,” and this translation generally answers well, as at chap. vi. 5, &c. But it must be observed that at Matt. xiv. 2 and Mark vi. 14 the Authorised Version is incorrect, the proper translation being “these *powers work* in him.” It would have been well also that the rendering “mighty work” had been kept in many other places where it has been supplanted by “miracle.” This latter word, however, must almost of necessity be allowed to stand in such passages as Acts xix. 11, 1 Cor. xii. 29.

In the Authorised Version, at John xvii. 12 we read as follows:—“While I was with them in the world, I *kept* them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have *kept*, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition.” The two Greek verbs† here both rendered “kept” have clearly different shades of meaning, and to bring out these with precision adds to the beauty of the verse. The first one may be allowed to stand as “kept,” but the second means

\* δύναμις.

† τηρέω and φυλάσσω.

*guarded*, and should be **so** rendered. It is then seen that the clauses are very closely connected : the watchful guardianship, spoken of in the second clause as having been exercised by Christ over His disciples, being the cause of the safety belonging to them which is spoken of in the first.

The very impressive utterance of our Lord at John viii. 58 has not been altered in the text of the Revised Version, but a highly important note has been placed on the margin. When we read the words, “Before Abraham *was*, *I am*,” there is nothing in the English which suggests that the word “*was*” means “came into being,” while the expression “*I am*” denotes absolute existence. The two verbs\* are totally different in the original, and a marked contrast is implied between Abraham, a created being, and the uncreated Son of God.

There are four different words translated “people” in the Authorised Version. Each of these terms has its own special meaning, but it is impossible fully to preserve the distinction between the words in English. Two of them especially run together, and no attempt has been made to distinguish these in the Revised Version. The third term is generally rendered “Gentiles,” or “nations,” and is only once translated “people,” at Acts viii. 9. But the fourth† has often,

\*  $\gamma\imath\nu o\mu\alpha i$  and  $\epsilon i\mu i$ .

†  $\delta\chi\lambda\oslash s$ .

without cause, been so rendered, as at John vii. 20 and many other places. It always means the “common people,” as distinguished from those possessed of rank or authority, and should be translated “multitude,” or multitudes,” as it has been throughout the Revised Version.

We find five distinct verbs translated “teach” in the Authorised Version. One of these occurs with that rendering only in a single passage, Acts xvi. 21, and is there better translated, “set forth.” Two others are found twice with the rendering “teach,” or “taught,” and may be allowed so to stand; but the remaining two\* should be carefully distinguished. One is the word properly denoting “teach,” and occurs in multitudes of passages; the other is a much rarer word, being used only four times in the New Testament. It means “to make disciples,” and is clearly distinguished from “to teach” at Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, though the two are confounded in the Authorised Version. The passage should be rendered, “Go ye therefore, and *make disciples* of all the nations . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you;” and in the other passages—Matt. xiii. 52, xxvii. 57; Acts xiv. 21—where the word occurs the same strict rendering will be found given to it in the Revised Version.

\* διδάσκω and μαθητεύω.

There are some passages in which a reader of the Authorised Version is almost sure to imagine that there is some connection between different words, from the manner in which they have been translated. This may, for instance, be the case at James i. 6, where these words occur : “ He that *wavereth* is like a *wave* of the sea driven with the wind and tossed.” There is no connection whatever between the words *wave* and *wavereth*; and the passage stands thus in the Revised Version : “ He that doubteth is like the surge of the sea driven by the wind and tossed.” So again, at Rom. xii. 2, where these words occur in the Authorised Version : “ Be not *conformed* to this world : but be ye *transformed* by the renewing of your mind.” Here there is no connection in the original between the terms\* rendered “ conformed ” and “ transformed ; ” as might be inferred from the sound of the words in English. The passage is thus rendered in the Revised Version : “ Be not fashioned according to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind.”

It is well known that two very different Greek words† are alike rendered “ devil ” in the Authorised Version. There is, first, the word which occurs in such passages as Matt. iv. 1, John xiii. 2, &c., and which has reference to the prince of darkness. Next there

\* συσχηματίζεσθαι and μεταμορφοῦσθαι.

† διάβολος and δαιμόνιον, or δαιμων.

is the word which is literally “daemon,” and which is so often used in connection with those unhappy beings who are described as *daemonized*, or “possessed of devils.” This “possession was a disease like epilepsy, for the victim was ‘healed,’ and some kind of insanity, for the ‘right mind’ was restored. But it was something more—the intrusion of an alien force into the nervous system, impeding sensation, so that the patient was deaf and dumb ; with perfect organs, but without power to use them ; his will overlorded (Acts x. 38) by an alien might, which created the confusion of an apparently dual consciousness. The rendering of the two distinct terms by the same word obliterates a very marked distinction to the English reader.”\* It is, indeed, much to be regretted that the word “daemon” was not introduced into the earliest versions of the New Testament which were made into our language. Had that been done, the expression would soon have established itself as clearly marking a distinction between the evil spirits so named and the great adversary—the devil. In the Revised Version the common rendering has been retained as now almost a matter of necessity, but wherever the word “daemon” has been translated “devil” the fact is indicated on the margin.

There is a simple Greek verb which is usually

\* Eadie’s *English Bible*, ii. 433.

and properly translated “judge,” but it is erroneously rendered “condemn” at John iii. 17, 18. In like manner, the simple substantives connected with it are generally represented by “judgment” in English, but improperly by “damnation” at Matt. xxiii. 33, Mark xii. 40, and other places. On the other hand, a compound of the verb referred to with a preposition is somewhat inexactly rendered by “judge” at 1 Cor. iv. 3, 4. 5, although all that has there been done in the Revised Version is to place another translation on the margin. The reference seems to be to the preliminary examination of accused persons—what is known in Scotch law as a “precognition.” We have an example of this at Acts xxv. 26; but, however useful this may be in human affairs, the Apostle protests against it in matters spiritual as an unwarrantable anticipation of the judgment of the great day. There is another compound of the same verb which is also improperly rendered “judge” at 1 Cor. xi. 31; it should be translated “discern,” as in ver. 29. A third\* compound is correctly rendered “condemn,” as at Matt. xii. 41 and most other passages, but “damned,” which occurs at Mark xvi. 16 and Rom. xiv. 23, is now too strong an expression, and has been avoided in the Revised Version.

\* The several Greek terms are *κρίνω*, *κρίμα*, *κρίσις*, *ἀνακρίνω*, *διακρίνω*, *κατακρίνω*.

Three words\* are in common translated “brightness” in the Authorised Version which, nevertheless, admit of being easily distinguished. One of the expressions occurs in that striking passage, Heb. i. 3, in which we read of Christ, “Who being the *brightness* of his glory,” &c. Here the word might be mistakenly supposed to mean a *reflected* splendour, but the true meaning is a radiance which is flashed forth; and therefore the translation “effulgence” has been adopted in the Revised Version. At Acts xxvi. 13, on the other hand, “brightness” is the exact translation of the Greek, while at 2 Thess. ii. 8 it is totally wrong, and must give place to some such word as “manifestation.”

The Greek words which denote the *act of dying* and the *state of death* respectively have not unfrequently been confounded in the Authorised Version, sometimes to the great obscuration of the sense. Thus, the constantly recurring words “are dead,” in Rom. vi. 2, &c., should be translated “died.” This emendation is specially important at 2 Cor. v. 14, where the common rendering, “We thus judge, that if one died for all, then *were all dead*,” completely ruins the sense. It should be, “We thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all *did*”—that is, all believers died in and with Christ.

\* ἀπαύγασμα, λαμπρότης, πιφάνεια.

† ἐπέθανον.

## CHAPTER V.

CORRECTION OF NEEDLESS VARIATIONS IN THE  
TRANSLATION OF THE SAME GREEK WORDS.

THIS is the opposite error to that which was considered in the preceding chapter, and is not less to be regretted. It is even more characteristic of the Authorised Version than the former, for it was committed of set purpose by our translators. They do not say that they wilfully confounded one Greek word with another in their translation ; but they do tell us that it was one of the principles of their work to vary in the renderings which were given in different passages to the same words in the original. In their noble preface, entitled "The Translators to the Reader," they say, towards the close : "Another thing we think good to admonish thee of, gentle reader, that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing or to an identity of words, as some, peradventure, would wish that we had done, because they observe that some learned men somewhere have been as exact as they could that way.

Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places (for there be some words that be not of the same sense everywhere), we were especially careful, and made a conscience according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word—as, for example, if we translate the *Hebrew* or *Greek* once by *purpose*, never to call it *intent*; if one where *journeying*, never *travelling*; if one where *think*, never *suppose*; if one where *pain*, never *ache*; if one where *joy*, never *gladness*, &c.—thus to mince the matter we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the atheist than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them if we may be free? use one precisely when we may use another no less fit as commodiously? . . .

“We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good *English* words. For as it is written of a certain great philosopher that he should say that those logs were happy that were made images to be worshipped, for their fellows, as good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire, so if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always; and to others of like quality, Get you hence

be banished for ever, we might be taxed, peradventure, with *St. James's* words, namely, '*To be partial in ourselves, and judges of evil thoughts.*'"

Now, it must readily be granted that, to some extent, this variety of rendering was not only justifiable but necessary. It is most certain that the same Greek word has not always the same meaning in different places ; to insist, therefore, on always rendering it by the same word in English would be absurd. This appears clearly enough from the variety of senses which one word may possess in our own language. Take, e.g., the one expression "post," and consider how varied is its signification in such phrases as "He held that post," "He missed the post," "He fixed the post," "He travelled post," &c. All these varying significations of the word would of necessity require the use of different terms in translating the English phrases into another language. And so is it with Greek when rendered into English. Different words must be chosen at different places to represent the original according to the exigencies of the several passages. Thus, the same verb which is properly rendered by "comfort" at Matt. v. 4, &c., must be translated by "beseech" at Matt. viii. 5, &c., and by "exhort" at <sup>1</sup> Peter v. 1, &c. Thus, too, the noun which is rendered "kind" at Matt. xiii. 47, &c., must be translated by such a word as "race" at Acts vii. 13, &c.,

and “offspring” at Acts xvii. 28, &c. No one, therefore, would insist on the same English word being used for the same Greek word in all passages. Variation is to some extent an absolute necessity, and the only question is whether our translators have varied their renderings unnecessarily and unreasonably, so as, in fact, to have diminished the value of their work. That such is in reality the case will become plain to every one from the following illustrations.

We may begin by looking at some passages in which an interesting or important truth is obscured by the needless changes of rendering which are adopted.

Thus, at 1 Cor. iii. 17 we read in the Authorised Version, “If any man *defile* the temple of God, him shall God *destroy*.” But the Greek verb is the same in both clauses, and thus the solemn thought is suggested that, as is the sin so will be the punishment: God will treat the man as the man has treated the sacred temple of his own soul. This correspondence between the guilt contracted and the penalty inflicted is entirely veiled from the English reader by the capricious variety of rendering adopted, and the same word should manifestly be preserved in both clauses: “If any man *destroyeth* the temple of God, him shall God *destroy*.” Again, what reader of Mark xv. 33, “There was darkness over the whole *land* until the ninth hour,” and of

Luke xxiii. 44, “There was darkness over all the *earth* until the ninth hour,” would imagine that the original of both passages is exactly the same? The one Evangelist is made to differ from the other in a most important particular by the totally uncalled for and unwarrantable variety of rendering which is adopted. Either “land” or “earth” (doubtless, I think, the former) ought manifestly to be chosen in both passages, as well as at Matt. xxvii. 45. One other example of the darkening effect of a needless variation of rendering is found at Rev. iv. 4. The Authorised Version there reads, “And round about the *throne* were four and twenty *seats*: and upon the *seats* I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment; and they had on their heads crowns of gold.” Under the influence of a timidity which shrank from appearing to make creatures equal in dignity to the great Creator, our translators have here failed to do justice to the original. The word rendered “throne” and “seats” is the same in Greek, so that we ought to read, “And round about the *throne* were four and twenty *thrones*,” the great Scriptural truth being thus illustrated that Christ’s redeemed not only see His glory, but share in it—they “reign together with him” (2 Tim. ii. 12). A like mistaken scrupulousness has prevented the proper rendering “throne” being given at Rev. ii. 13 and xvi. 10. Instead of “Satan’s *seat*” and “the *seat*

of the beast," we ought to read, "Satan's *throne*" and "the *throne* of the beast," for this rendering is in keeping with the fact that in the Apocalypse, "as nowhere else in Scripture, is set forth the hellish parody of the heavenly kingdom: the conflict between the true King of the earth and the usurping king;”\* the mimicking by Satan, in his presumptuous vain-glory of that real and eternal majesty which is possessed by Christ.

Let us now turn to some passages in which a needless variety of rendering is apt to suggest a baseless idea to the English reader, or at least to blunt for him the force of the original.

When these words are read at Matt. xxv. 46, "And these shall go away into *everlasting* punishment; but the righteous into life *eternal*," the English reader can hardly fail to suppose that some diversity exists in the original, and thus, perhaps, is led to perplex himself as to the difference of meaning between "everlasting" and "eternal." But since the Greek word is the same in both clauses the translation evidently ought to be consistent, as in the Revised Version. Again, it has frequently been noticed how capricious and hurtful are the varieties of rendering given in the fourth chapter of Romans to the one Greek word translated, first of all, "counted" in verse 3. The word occurs

\* Trench, *On Authorised Version*, p. 54.

no fewer than eleven times in the course of the chapter, and is variously translated “count” (ver. 3, 5), “reckon” (ver. 4, 9, 10), “impute” (ver. 6, 8, 11, 22, 23, 24), the version turning from one expression to another in the most arbitrary and unaccountable manner. It is needless to say how the English reader is apt to be confused by such changes, and how much is gained in point of clearness by the retention of the same rendering throughout. In the seventh chapter of the same Epistle the force of the argument in ver. 7, 8 is greatly weakened through want of uniformity in the rendering. Words radically the same in the original are variously rendered “lust,” “covet,” “concupiscence,” in the Authorised Version: thus, “What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known *lust*, except the law had said, Thou shalt not *covet*. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of *concupiscence*. For without the law sin was dead.” How much more clear and satisfactory does the argument appear when we read, “What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Howbeit, I had not known sin, except through the law: for I had not known *coveting*, except the law had said, Thou shalt not *covet*. But sin, finding an occasion, wrought in me through the commandment all manner of *coveting*. For

apart from the law sin is dead.” The same injurious effect of what was, no doubt, intended as an agreeable variety of rendering is noticeable in the second Epistle to the Corinthians. That Epistle is remarkable for the use of *key-words* (if we may so call them) occurring one after the other. In the first chapter the two antithetic expressions “comfort” and “affliction” are repeated again and again (ver. 4, 6, &c.) by the Apostle; but the impression thus made on a reader of the original is weakened to an English reader by the capricious substitution of “tribulation” for “affliction,” and “consolation” for “comfort.” So, again, where the Apostle introduces the word “veil” or its derivatives, at chap. iii. 15, 18, iv. 3, the connection between the verses is obliterated by the renderings “with *open* face” instead of “with *unveiled* face,” and “if our gospel be *hid*” for “if our gospel is *veiled*.” So at several other passages of the Epistle.

With regard to quotations from the Old Testament, it is obvious that where these are made in the same words in the Greek they ought to be similarly given in English. But this is far from being the case in the Authorised Version. Thus, the great text, Gen. xv. 6, is quoted four times by St. Paul in the very same manner (Rom. iv. 3, 9, 22; Gal. iii. 6), and each time is somewhat varied in the translation: (1) “was *counted* unto him for righteousness,” (2) “was *reckoned*

to Abraham for righteousness," (3) "was *imputed* to him for righteousness," (4) "was *accounted* to him for righteousness." Again, Deut. xxxii. 35 is twice quoted (Rom. xii. 19; Heb. x. 30) in the very same words, yet it is thus variously rendered in the two passages: (1) "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord," (2) "Vengeance (belongeth) unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord." Once more, the same arbitrary variation of texts quoted from the Old Testament in exactly the same words occurs in passages so near each other as Heb. iii. 11 and Heb. iv. 3. The words are rendered, (1) "So I sware in my wrath, They shall not enter into my rest," and (2) "As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest;" while the last clause is repeated in the same form at ver. 5, "If they shall enter into my rest." It is well known that this latter form of expression, unintelligible in English, is, according to Hebrew idiom, equivalent to a strong negative, so that the clause should always be rendered, "They shall not enter into my rest."

Not a word need be said in support of the position that parallel passages in the Gospels and other parts of Scripture, which are expressed in the same words in Greek, ought to be similarly given in English. Any other course almost amounts to unfaithfulness to the original and cannot fail to mislead the reader. Yet

the Authorised Version is a very great offender in this respect. The following examples out of many may be quoted. At Matt. iv. 6 we find “*concerning thee,*” while at Luke iv. 10 the very same words are rendered “*over thee;*” and, in like manner, exactly coincident expressions are translated at Matt. iv. 19, “*Follow me,*” at Mark i. 17, “*Come ye after me;*” at Matt. x. 14, “*the dust,*” at Luke ix. 5, “*the very dust;*” at Matt. x. 22, “*but he that endureth to the end shall be saved,*” at Mark xiii. 13, “*but he that shall endure the same shall be saved;*” at Matt. xi. 19, “*behold a man gluttonous,*” at Luke vii. 34, “*behold a gluttonous man;*” at Matt. xvii. 19, “*apart,*” at Mark ix. 28, “*privately;*” at Matt. xix. 7, “*a writing,*” at Mark x. 4, “*a bill;*” at Matt. xxvi. 41, “*Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation : the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak,*” at Mark xiv. 38, “*Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit truly is ready, but the flesh is weak.*” And so in a multitude of other places, there not being a single chapter in the first three Gospels treating of the same subjects in which this needless and hurtful tendency to variation is not perceptible. So is it, to some extent, with parallel passages in the Epistles. Ephesians and Colossians, 2 Peter and Jude, have many points of connection between themselves, but these are considerably obscured to the English reader by varieties

of rendering which are adopted for the same words in the several Epistles. Thus, the word which is translated “working” at Eph. i. 9 is given as “operation” at Col. ii. 12; “lowliness” at Eph. iv. 2 is “humbleness of mind” at Col. iii. 12; “compacted” at Eph. iv. 6 is “knit together” at Col. ii. 19; “be obedient” at Eph. vi. 5 is “obey” at Col. iii. 22; “government” at 2 Pet. ii. 10 is “dominion” at Jude, ver. 8; and “mist” at 2 Pet. ii. 17 is “blackness” at Jude, ver. 13. It is evident to how great disadvantage the English reader is thus subjected in seeking to compare Scripture with Scripture, and to derive light from one passage for the full understanding of another.

If not practically very important, it is at least interesting and desirable that uniformity of rendering should be preserved in regard to expressions which are fitted to suggest the individuality of the sacred writers to an English reader. They have all a more or less marked style of their own. St. Matthew’s Gospel is distinguished by a strong Hebrew colouring, St. Mark’s by a somewhat rude yet graphic character, St. Luke’s by a comparatively close approach to classical models of composition, and St. John’s by the softness and fulness of its diction. Each of the Evangelists also displays a predilection for certain forms of expression. St. Matthew generally uses the

phrase, “kingdom of *heaven*,” where the other Evangelists have “kingdom of *God*;” the formula “gospel of the kingdom” is also peculiar to him, and he is very partial to the use of the Greek particle, for “then,” which occurs no less than *ninety* times in his Gospel—oftener, that is, than in all the other Gospels taken together. St. Mark’s favourite expression is “straightway,” which is found more than *forty* times in his Gospel—that is, again, oftener than in all the other Gospels put together. Now, it is obvious that such marked features in the first two Gospels should be preserved, as they easily may be, in translation. But the Authorised Version has, to a considerable extent, failed to do this in the case of St. Mark, by giving the one word which he so constantly uses such varying translations as “straightway,” “immediately,” “forthwith,” “anon,” “as soon as,” while the first of these renderings might have been preserved throughout. St. Luke evinces no very striking fondness for any particular term or form of expression : his vocabulary is far wider than that of the other Evangelists ; but it may be remarked that while he is no such mannerist as St. Matthew or St. Mark, the Greek preposition for “with” appears in his Gospel oftener than in all the others. St. John, again, is at once seen to delight in the repetition of certain words, such as to *abide*, and to *bear witness*. The former verb occurs over *forty* times in his Gospel,

and the latter over *thirty* times, while its cognate substantive is found *fourteen* times. But this is, to a great extent, hidden from an English reader through the variety of renderings admitted in the Authorised Version. For “abide” we have “remain,” “tarry,” “endure,” “dwell,” “continue,” “being present,” while in almost every passage “abide” is quite a satisfactory translation. For “witness,” again, we find the needless variations, “bear witness,” “testify,” “bear record,” “gave” (in the first Epistle of St. John), and “hath good report” (in third Epistle), while the connected substantive, “witness,” is every now and then replaced by “record” or “testimony.” With respect to St. Paul, it has been observed how readily he catches up and uses for his own purpose an expression which has fallen from the lips of an opponent. This may be illustrated by a reference to Acts xxvi. 24, 25, though the point is lost in our common English version. The same word is used in both verses; and if instead of, “Paul, thou art beside thyself,” we read, “Paul, thou art *mad*,” we then feel the force of the Apostle’s reply: “I am not *mad*, most excellent Festus; but speak forth words of truth and soberness.” All such minute accuracies, though they may be deemed trifling, should be carefully attended to in translation.

It is strange to notice what different degrees of

force are given to the same word in different passages of the Authorised Version. Thus, what is “beloved” in Matt. xvii. 5 and Mark ix. 7 becomes “dear” in Eph. v. 1, while it ascends into “well-beloved” at Mark xii. 6, and “dearly beloved” at Rom. xii. 19. No English reader would imagine that it is the same word in the original which is thus rendered with such varying degrees of intensity. So the term which means “palsied” (Luke v. 18, &c.) sinks into “feeble” at Heb. xii. 12. This sort of caprice may sometimes be found in two successive verses. The word, for instance, which is translated simply at Gal. iv. 8 “did service” rises in the following verse to this rendering, “to be in bondage.” In parallel passages, again, we find a varying force given to the very same words. Thus, what is “much displeased” at Mark x. 41 is represented by “moved with indignation” at Matt. xx. 24, and what is simply “chief” at Matt. xx. 27 becomes “chiefest” at Mark x. 44. A reflecting English reader cannot fail to be puzzled by such groundless variations.

Much inconsistency exists in the Authorised Version with respect to the translation given of the terms *Rabbi* and *Rabboni*. Sometimes the original word is retained, as at Matt. xxiii. 7, John i. 38, &c.; at other times it is rendered “Master,” as at Matt. xxvi. 25; John iv. 31, &c.; while *Rabboni* is preserved at John

xx. 16, but translated “Lord” at Mark x. 51. Being a well-known title of respect among the Jews, the term “Rabbi” should have been preserved throughout; and this seems specially important at Matt. xxvi. 49, Mark xv. 45, as suggesting the profound dissimulation of Judas, who spoke to Christ in this style of complimentary address while in the very act of betraying Him.

There are two closely related words, which occur at Acts xix. 37 and Rom. ii. 22, which are so differently rendered in the Authorised Version that no English reader would ever suspect any connection between them. In the first passage we find “robbers of *churches*,” and in the second “dost thou commit *sacrilege*? ” Heathen temples are in both cases referred to, so that the respective renderings should be “robbers of temples” and “dost thou rob temples?”

Another passage may be referred to, in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, in which variation of rendering has broken the unity and connection of the Apostle’s train of thought. Having spoken of the solemn issues which hung on the acceptance or rejection of the Gospel by those who heard it, he exclaims, at chap. ii. 16, “And who is *sufficient* for these things?” After some intervening remarks, introduced in his own characteristic way, the Apostle returns, at chap.

iii. 5, to the consideration of the “sufficiency” referred to, and gives an answer to his own solemn question in these words:—“Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to account any thing as from ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God, who also *made us sufficient* as ministers of a new covenant,” &c. The translation in the Authorised Version of the last clause as “who also *hath made us able* ministers of the New Testament,” completely mars the harmony of the passage.

The above examples are sufficient to show how capricious, and often hurtful, are the different renderings often given to the same Greek word or phrase in the ordinary English version. Many of the variations are harmless so far as the meaning is concerned, but are, nevertheless, to be regretted as misleading to a reader who cannot consult the original. When such a reader finds at James ii. 2 the expression “goodly apparel,” and in the very next verse “gay clothing,” would he ever imagine that these different terms are a translation of the very same Greek words? Again, would the thought ever occur to him that the word rendered “rule” and “line of things” represented the same original in the following enigmatical passage as it stands in the Authorised Version?—“Not boasting of things without our measure, that is, of other men’s labours; but

having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you, according to our rule abundantly, to preach the Gospel in the regions beyond you, and not to boast in another man's *line of things* made ready to our hand" (2 Cor. x. 15, 16).

After all that has been said, no sufficient idea will have been conveyed to readers unacquainted with the subject of the vast amount of unnecessary variation in the translation of the same Greek words which exists in the Authorised Version. Pages might be filled with additional examples. The most arbitrary and uncalled-for changes will frequently be found in the compass of a few verses, or even of the same verse. Thus, the word rendered "profession" in 1 Tim. vi. 12 is changed into "confession" in ver. 13; "jailor," in Acts xvi. 23, gives place to "keeper of the prison" in ver. 27. "God, even the Father," at Rom. xv. 6, &c., becomes "God and the Father" at Col. iii. 17, and "the God and Father" at 1 Pet. i. 3, &c. The word rendered "truth" in the parenthetical clause of 1 Tim. ii. 7 appears as "verity" at the close of the verse; and so on, in almost innumerable cases, the variations generally having no ground of advantage or necessity, and serving only to bewilder and mislead the English reader.

The great object to be kept in view in every

translation is to place the reader of it as nearly as possible on a footing of equality with one who has access to the original. This is especially desirable in regard to a version of the Holy Scriptures. Those who have the privilege of reading God's Word in the form in which it came from Himself ought to recognise it as their bounden duty to do their utmost that their less favoured brethren may have as exact and accurate a transcript of the original in their own language as can be furnished. To secure this object, scholarship may worthily put forth all its powers and diligence strain its efforts to the uttermost. The plain man's Bible—though it cannot be all to him that the original is to the scholar—should, at least, contain no obscurities or errors which erudition and pains-taking are able to remove. It should be such, for example, as that he shall have it in his power, through consistency of translation, to form an opinion respecting the questions discussed in connection with the verbal agreements and differences found in the first three Evangelists. It should be such that he will be able, by means of a Concordance, to compare passages in which the same word occurs, and thus to make them mutually explanatory of each other. For the reasons that have been stated this cannot be done with any certainty while using the ordinary English translation, since in it there is, on the one hand, an

unnecessary confounding of one Greek word with another in the rendering which is given ; while, on the other hand, there is a vast amount of needless variation in the translation of the same Greek words ; but both these causes of possible, or certain, mistake have been guarded against in the Revised Version.

## PART III.

---

### THE ANGLO-AMERICAN REVISION.

#### I.—THE ENGLISH VERSION OF 1611.

THE English version of the Holy Scriptures now in common use was prepared, on the basis of previous versions, by a large body of divines and scholars of the Church of England, appointed by King James the First, whose name it bears. His connection with it, however, is only nominal. He accepted at the Hampton Court Conference, in January, 1604 (from vanity and policy, rather than from any higher motive), the suggestion of Dr. Reynolds (President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford), but gave the work no pecuniary aid, and no sanction after it was finished. By granting the request for a new version he pleased the Puritan party; and, by abusing the Geneva version, with its alleged “seditious and traitorous notes,” as “the worst” ever made, he conciliated the Conformists and allayed their suspicion. Both parties heartily acquiesced, and united in what proved to be a necessary and most useful work.

The revisers (nominally fifty-four, but actually forty-seven in number) were divided into six companies, each being assigned a certain portion of the Scriptures, under the restriction of fifteen rules, and met, two at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge. They received no compensation, except indirectly by way of preferments, and the necessary expenses were mostly paid by the publisher, Robert Barker. Their names are now forgotten, but their work still lives, and will never die. They left us no official record of their labors. “Never” (says Dr. Scrivener) “was a great enterprise like the production of our Authorized Version carried out with less knowledge handed down to posterity of the laborers, their method and order of working.” Selden, in his “Table Talk,” has preserved a hint as to the mode of proceeding, saying: “The translation in King James’ time took an excellent way. That part of the Bible was given to him who was most excellent in such a tongue (as the Apocrypha to Andrew Downs), and then they met together, and one read the translation, the rest holding in their hands some Bible, either of the learned tongues, or French, Spanish, Italian, etc.; if they found any fault, they spoke; if not, he read on.” It is rather strange that among the modern versions he should have omitted Luther’s German version, which is cer-

tainly far more important than the Italian and Spanish.

The translation of the whole Bible appeared at London in 1611, seven years after the Hampton Court Conference, where it originated, in a large folio volume, printed in black letter, with an adulatory dedication “to the Most High and Mighty Prince James, by the grace of God, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith,” etc., and with a long and learned preface by Dr. Miles Smith, one of the translators. It gradually superseded all older translations by its superior merits, without formal authorization either by King, Privy Council, or Parliament, or Convocation. It derives its authority from the verdict of the Christian public. This is the best kind of authority.

In forming a just estimate of this greatest achievement of the English Church, we must first of all remember that it is not a personal and sectional, but a truly national and catholic work. It cannot be traced to any single author or authors, like Wiclif’s Bible and Luther’s Bible. It resembles in this respect the Apostles’ Creed and the Anglican Liturgy. It is the mature result of three generations of the Reformation period. It gathers up the ripe fruits of the previous labors of Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Cranmer, the Bishops’ Bible, the Geneva Bible, and

the Rheims New Testament. It is especially indebted to William Tyndale (1525-1535) for its idiom and vocabulary, and to the Geneva translators (1560) for its accuracy.\*

\* In this respect the king's instructions and his contempt for the Geneva version were happily overruled by the better knowledge and judgment of his translators. He ordered the "Bishops' Bible," prepared in the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1568 and 1572), to be made the basis, but it exercised far less influence than the more popular "Geneva Bible," which was prepared by English exiles and confessors in Geneva under the eyes of Calvin and Beza, directly from the original Hebrew and Greek throughout (1557 and 1560), and issued in more than a hundred editions. The Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament from the Latin Vulgate, which appeared at Rheims in 1582 (followed by the translation of the Old Testament at Douay in 1610), is not even mentioned in the instructions, and yet was evidently of great use. The examples of mistranslations which Dr. Reynolds quoted at the Hampton Court Conference as arguments for the need of a new version, are all taken from the Great Bible and the Bishops' Bible, and were corrected in the Geneva Bible. "It is obvious," says Dr. Moulton ("History of the English Bible," p. 207), "that the Genevan and Rhemish versions have exercised much greater influence than the Great, and Bishops' Bible." He gives as a specimen a passage from Isa. 54: 11-17, which contains 182 words; of these, 86 words are the same in five or six English versions; 96 vary, and among these variations more than 60 are taken from the Geneva Bible, and only 12 from the Bishops' Bible (pp. 201-206). No authority was more frequently fol-

But upon the whole the version of 1611 surpassed all its predecessors. It is probably the best version ever made for public use. It is not simply a translation, but a living reproduction of the original Scriptures in idiomatic English, by men as reverent and devout as they were learned. It reads like an original work, such as the prophets and apostles might have written in the seventeenth century for English

lowed, both for text and interpretation, than Beza of Geneva, whose Greek Testament (the fourth edition, 1589, and the fifth edition, 1598) was the chief basis of the Authorized Version, as Dr. Ezra Abbot has shown (in Schaff's essay on Revision, pp. xxviii. *sqq.*). Dr. Westcott (in his "History of the English Bible," pp. 294 *sqq.*) has proved by a careful comparison the great and beneficial influence of Beza, both upon the Geneva Version and the Authorized Version. The University of Cambridge, in thanking Beza for the valuable gift of Codex D of the New Testament in 1581, acknowledges its preference for him and John Calvin above any man that ever lived since the days of the apostles. (See Dr. Scrivener, "Codex Bezæ," Introd. p. vi., and "Introd. to the Critic. of the N. Test." 2d ed., p. 112). A number of errors, as well as excellencies, can be traced to Beza, and some have found an injurious effect of his strong pre-destinarianism in the rendering of a few passages (Matt. 20: 23; Acts 2: 47; Heb. 10: 38); but this may be disputed. Upon the whole, the revisers could not do better than follow Calvin and Beza, who were undoubtedly the ablest biblical scholars of the Reformed Church in the sixteenth century. Comp. Eadie, "The English Bible," vol. ii. 16 *sqq.*, 30.

readers. It reveals an easy mastery of the rich resources of the English language, the most cosmopolitan of all modern languages, and blends with singular felicity Saxon force and Latin melody. Even its prose reads like poetry, and sounds like music. It is the first of English classics, and the greatest modern authors have drawn inspiration from this “pure well of English undefiled.” Its best recommendation is its universal adoption and use in every Protestant church and household that speaks the English tongue. It has admirably served its purpose for more than two hundred and fifty years, and is so interwoven with English and American literature that it can never be entirely superseded. Next to Christianity itself, the version of 1611 is the greatest boon which a kind Providence has bestowed upon the English race. It carries with it to the ends of the globe all that is truly valuable in our civilization, and gives strength, beauty, and happiness to our domestic, social, and national life.

But with all its acknowledged excellencies, it is the product of imperfect men, and has innumerable minor errors and defects.\* This has long since been

\* The first two editions of 1611 had also a large number of serious typographical errors, such as “Judas” for “Jesus” (in Matt. 26 : 36); “serve thee” for “serve me” (Ex. 9 : 13); “hoops” for “hooks”; “plaine” for “plague”; “ye shall

felt by those who know it best and love it most. It may be greatly improved without sacrificing any of its merits. God has not seen fit to provide the Church, by a miracle, with infallible translators any more than with infallible transcribers, printers, and readers. He desires a worship in spirit and in truth, not an idolatry of the letter. The translators had sound principles, except that of unnecessary variations in rendering, and they made the best use of their resources. But the resources of the seventeenth century were limited : biblical philology, geography, and archaeology were yet in their infancy, and comparative philology and textual criticism were not yet born. Since that time biblical scholarship in all its branches has made vast progress, especially within the last fifty years. The Greek and Hebrew languages, with all their cognate dialects, are better known now

not eat" for "ye shall eat ;" "shewed" for "hewed," etc. See a long list in Dr. Eadie's "*The English Bible*," vol. ii. 291 *sqq.* A great many typographical blunders and variations crept in in subsequent editions. A committee of the American Bible Society, in examining six different editions of the Authorized Version, discovered nearly 24,000 variations in the text and punctuation. See "*Report of the History and Recent Collation of the English Version of the Bible*, presented by the Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, and adopted May 1st, 1851" (printed in the American Bible House, p. 31).

than ever before. The oldest and best uncial manuscripts of the Greek Testament have recently been discovered and thoroughly examined, together with the ancient versions and patristic quotations. The lands of the Bible have been made as familiar to scholars as their native country, and the Land and the Book illustrate each other to the present generation as they did to the original readers on the banks of the Nile, at the foot of Mount Sinai, on the shores of Lake Gennesareth, and the top of Mount Olivet.

Hence the growing demand in England and America for a thorough, yet conservative revision, that shall be faithful to the original Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, and yet faithful also to the idiom and vocabulary of the Authorized Version, so as to read like a new book, with all the charms and sacred associations of the old. In other words, the age calls for such a revision as shall purge the old version of its errors and inconsistencies, adapt it to the language and scholarship of the nineteenth century, command the confidence of all English-speaking churches, and be a new bond of union and strength among them.

This is the sole object of the revision, which was undertaken as a common work for the benefit of all the English readers of the Word of God, and which has been carried on for the last ten years by about

eighty biblical scholars of England and the United States.

## II.—THE CANTERBURY REVISION OF 1870.

The Anglo-American Revision originated, after long and thorough discussion of the subject, in the Convocation of Canterbury, the mother church of Anglo-Saxon Christendom; but by a rare combination of circumstances it assumed at the very outset an oecumenical character, co-extensive with the English-speaking community of the old and new world. It was first intrusted to a commission of sixteen biblical scholars—eight bishops and eight presbyters—of the Church of England, appointed by Convocation, May 6th, 1870, under certain rules of a conservative, yet more liberal character than those of King James. The Church of England is the mother of the Authorized Version, and has an undoubted right to take the lead in any movement for an improvement of the same. She still represents the largest membership, the strongest institutions, the richest literature, among those ecclesiastical organizations which have sprung from the common English stock. She would never accept a revision made by any other denomination. She has all the necessary qualifications of learning and piety to pro-

duce, without foreign aid, as good a version for our age as King James' revisers produced for their age.

But, on the other hand, it is equally clear that a revision of exclusively Anglican authorship could not command the confidence and secure the acceptance of other denominations. No sectarian version can succeed even within sectarian limits. There is a commonwealth of Christian life and scholarship which transcends all sectarian boundaries, however useful and necessary they may be in their own place. Times have considerably changed since the reign of King James, who could conceive of no State without a king, and of no Church without a bishop, and who, at the Hampton Court Conference, laid down his short method with Dissenters in these words : "I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse, just hang them, that is all." English Christendom has wonderfully spread, and embraces now two powerful nations, which have an equal inheritance in the English Bible, and can justly claim a share in its revision for their own use. The British and American Bible Societies distribute more Bibles now in one year than were previously circulated in a whole century.

This was felt by the originators of the movement. The Anglican Committee was therefore clothed, at the time of its appointment, with power "to invite the co-

operation of any eminent for scholarship, *to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.*" Under this wise and liberal rule even Roman Catholics and Jews might be invited, but catholicity has its limits in the extent of sympathy and the laws of co-operation. We must aim at what is attainable, and not waste time and strength on utopian schemes.

Accordingly, at the first meeting of the Committee of Convocation, under the presidency of the late Dr. Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Winchester, it was resolved to enlarge the Committee by appointing about forty distinguished biblical scholars of the various Churches of Great Britain. A few declined (among them Cardinal Newman and Dr. Pusey), but most of them accepted, and others were added. Several changes have taken place by death and resignation.

The Committee was divided into two Companies, one for the revision of the Old Testament (presided over by the Bishop of Winchester), the other for the revision of the New (under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol). They held regular monthly meetings in the Jerusalem Chamber of historic fame, and in the Chapter Library, belonging to the Deanery of Westminster. The members co-operated on terms of equality ; but the Episcopal members are, as may be expected, largely in the ma-

jority. The whole number of English revisers in 1880 amounted to 52 (27 in the Old Testament Company, 25 in the New Testament Company). More than two-thirds belong to the Church of England. The Independents, the Wesleyans, the Baptists, and the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland (which had no share in the Authorized Version except as the disowned mother of King James), are well represented in the Committee. Among these revisers are several of the ablest and soundest biblical scholars of the age, who would be selected by all competent judges as preëminently fitted for the task.

### III.—AMERICAN CO-OPERATION.

Soon after the organization of the English Committee, a courteous invitation was extended to American scholars to co-operate with them in this work of common interest. In view of the great distance, it was deemed best to organize a separate Committee, that should fairly represent the biblical scholarship of the leading Churches and literary institutions of the United States. Such a Committee, consisting of about thirty members, was formed in 1871, and entered upon active work in October, 1872, when the first revision of the synoptical Gospels was received. It was likewise divided into two Companies, which

met every month (except in July and August) in the Bible House at New York (but without any connection with the American Bible Society), and co-operated with their English brethren on the same principles and with the intention of bringing out one and the same revision for both countries. Ex-President Dr. Woolsey, of New Haven, acted as permanent chairman of the New Testament Company; Dr. Green, Professor in Princeton, as chairman of the Old Testament Company. The two Committees exchanged the results of their labors in confidential communications. The New Testament was completed in October, 1880, just five hundred years after the first English translation of the whole Bible by Wiclid. The revision of the Old Testament is still in progress on both sides of the Atlantic, and will be finished in three or four years.

If it be asked by what authority the American Committee was appointed, we can only say, by the authority of the British Committee which was vested in it from the beginning by the Convocation of Canterbury. The American Churches were not consulted, except the Protestant Episcopal Church, which declined to act officially. The selection was carefully made from expert biblical scholars (mostly professors of Greek and Hebrew), and with an eye to a fair representation of the leading denominations

and theological institutions of the country, within the necessary limits of convenience for united work. Experience and public sentiment, as far as expressed have approved the choice.

There never was a more faithful and harmonious body of competent scholars engaged in a more important work on the American Continent. Representatives of half a dozen different denominations—Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, Reformed, also one Unitarian, one Friend, and one Lutheran—have met for eight years, and are still meeting every month, at great personal inconvenience and without prospect of reward, discussing innumerable differences of text and rendering. Their simple purpose was to give to the people the nearest equivalent in idiomatic English for the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, on the basis of the idiom and vocabulary of the Authorized Version. Christian courtesy, kindness, and genuine catholicity of spirit have characterized all their proceedings. They will ever look back upon these monthly meetings in the Bible House with unmixed satisfaction and thanks to God who gave them health and grace to go through such a difficult and laborious task with unbroken and ever-deepening friendship. After concluding their work (Oct. 22, 1880) the members of the New Testament Company parted almost in tears

with mingled feelings of joy and sadness. Four of their number (the Rev. Drs. Horatio B. Hackett, Henry B. Smith, Charles Hodge, and Professor James Hadley,) had died before, one (the Rev. Dr. Washburn) died soon after the completion, others are near the end of their earthly labors. But all hope to meet again where faith will be lost in vision, and where love and harmony will reign forever.

The funds for the necessary expenses of travelling, printing, room-rent, books, and clerical aid were cheerfully contributed by liberal donors, who will receive in return a handsome memorial copy of the first and best University edition of the Revised New Testament as soon as issued.

#### IV.—THE CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN COMMITTEE.

The Constitution of the American Committee was first submitted in draft by its President to several leading members of the English Committee, in the summer of 1871, and adopted, with some modifications, at the meeting for organization on December 7th, 1871. It is as follows :

“ I. The American Committee, invited by the British Committee engaged in the revision of the Authorized English Version of the Holy Scrip-

tures to co-operate with them, shall be composed of biblical scholars and divines in the United States.

“II. This Committee shall have the power to elect its officers, to add to its number, and to fill its own vacancies.

“III. The officers shall consist of a President, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Treasurer. The President shall conduct the official correspondence with the British revisers. The Secretary shall conduct the home correspondence.

“IV. New members of the Committee and corresponding members must be nominated at a previous meeting, and elected unanimously by ballot.

“V. The American Committee shall co-operate with the British Companies on the basis of the principles and rules of revision adopted by the British Committee.

“VI. The American Committee shall consist of two Companies : the one for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament.

“VII. Each Company shall elect its own Chairman and Recording Secretary.

“VIII. The British Companies will submit to the American Companies from time to time, such portions of their work as have passed the first revision, and

the American Companies will transmit their criticisms and suggestions to the British Companies before the second revision.

“IX. A joint meeting of the American and British Companies shall be held, if possible, in London, before final action.

“X. The American Committee, to pay their own expenses, and to have the ownership and control of the copyright of the Revised Version in the United States of America.”

The last article, as far as it refers to the publication of the revision, was abandoned, by the American Committee in the course of negotiations with the British Universities, for sufficient reasons, as will be shown below.

#### V.—THE RELATION OF THE AMERICAN AND ENGLISH COMMITTEES.

The Americans, as may be inferred from the preceding Constitution, accepted the invitation and entered upon the work with a clear understanding that they were to be fellow-revisers with equal rights and responsibilities as the members of the English Committee appointed under the rule of Convocation. No respectable scholars could have been found to bestow ten years’ labor on any other terms; nor

would the American churches, representing a larger population than that of England, ever accept a revision of their Bible in which they had no positive share and influence. The friends of revision contributed towards the expenses of the work expecting it to be a joint work of both Committees. The whole American community had the same understanding of the relation of the two Committees, and this alone accounts for the enormous demand of the Revised New Testament in the country, which has no parallel in the history of the book trade.\*

The natural mode of exercising the full right of membership is by voting on the changes to be adopted. But absent members cannot vote, and the intervening ocean made it impossible for the two Committees to meet jointly. The 9th Article of the American Constitution contemplates "a joint meeting" to be held in London before final action, "if possible." But such a meeting was found impracticable, and is superseded by another and better arrangement.

\* We learn from the New York agent of the Oxford University Press that he has good reason to expect orders for 200,000 copies of the Oxford editions of the revised New Testament, *before* the date of publication (May 17), notwithstanding the fact that half a dozen cheap reprints have already been announced all over the country.

Here, then, was a difficulty, which made itself felt at an early stage of the work. It led to confidential negotiations which we need not follow. They resulted at last in an agreement with the English Committee and the Delegates and Syndics of the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge, as the authorized publishers of the new Revision. This agreement, dated August 3d, 1877, seems upon the whole to be the best compromise that could be made in justice to all the parties concerned. It is in substance as follows :

The English Revisers promise to send confidentially their revision in its various stages to the American Revisers, to take all the American suggestions into special consideration before the conclusion of their labors, to furnish them before publication with copies of the Revision in its final form, and to allow them to present, in an Appendix to the Revised Scriptures, all the remaining differences of reading and rendering of importance, which the English Committee should decline to adopt ; while, on the other hand, the American Revisers pledge themselves to give their moral support to the authorized editions of the University Presses, with a view to their freest circulation within the United States, and not to issue a rival edition for a term of fourteen years.

By this arrangement the Americans secured the full recognition of their rights as fellow-revisers. In a joint meeting in London the changes proposed in the appendix would probably all be voted down, for the English Committee is much more numerous, and knows best what public opinion and taste in England require and can bear. On the other hand, the Americans may claim the same advantage as regards the views of their countrymen. In consideration of this honorable concession, they were quite willing to forego any other advantage.

The American Committee at one time, as the last article in the Constitution shows, considered the expediency of securing a copyright for the purpose of protecting the purity and integrity of the text against irresponsible reprints, and also as a means to defray the necessary expenses of the work, hoping to make an arrangement with an American publisher similar to that of the English Committee with the University Presses, instead of relying on voluntary contributions of friends. Beyond this they had no interest in a copyright, and never thought for a moment of using it for their own benefit. But after careful discussion and reflection it was deemed best to abandon the plan of legal protection, even for the appendix (which is exclusively their own literary property), and to give the revised Scriptures free to the American pub-

lic. The University Presses which are the authorized publishers of King James's Version in Great Britain, have the best possible facilities of publication, and will issue the revised New Testament at once, with the greatest typographical accuracy, in half a dozen different sizes, and at prices (from sixteen dollars down to fifteen cents) to suit all purchasers. They have, moreover, a strong claim on the public patronage, in view of their large outlay not only for printing and publishing, but also for the payment of the expenses (\$100,000) of the British Committee, which they assumed at a time when the success of the enterprise was altogether uncertain. The American Revisers, having paid their own expenses from voluntary contributions, are under no obligation to any publishing firm.

The new version, then, stands precisely on the same footing with the old version as to copyright. It is protected by law in England; it is free in America.

The American Revisers have already been blamed in some quarters for abandoning their undoubted right to issue an authorized American edition, and to protect their own work against inevitable piracy and mutilation. But would they not be still more blamed if they had given any publisher a monopoly over all the rest? And what would the Revisers do with such a golden elephant as the copy money for a book of

which millions will be sold within a few years? It would be sufficient to start a new Bible Society; but one national Bible Society is enough for America.

The people at large have certainly no reason to complain. They will reap the benefit from the plan adopted, which is undoubtedly the best for the widest and cheapest possible circulation of the Revised Scriptures throughout America and the world.

Several American reprints have been already extensively announced, and will no doubt likewise have a very large circulation. We learn that even daily papers intend to publish the Revised New Testament in their Sunday issues at four or five cents. There will be more reading and comparative study of the Bible within the next few years than there has ever been in the history of Christianity. The publication of the Revised New Testament will be a republication of the Gospel. This result alone will abundantly compensate for all the time and labor spent upon the Revision.

#### VI.—THE AMERICAN PART IN THE JOINT WORK.

The Revised New Testament, as authoritatively printed and published by the two English University Presses, is the joint work of both Committees. The English Revisers began a year earlier, and the

American Revisers worked on the basis of the first English Revision, but they had to go precisely through the same process of textual criticism and exegesis, to examine the same authorities, ancient and modern, and to discuss the same differences of rendering. They have spent probably the same amount of time and labor since they began to co-operate. They transmitted to England only the points of difference and suggestions of new changes. These were printed from time to time for the exclusive use of the Revisers, and would make altogether an octavo volume of about four hundred pages. Occasionally an elaborate essay was included in justification of a particular point, as the difference of reading in John 1 : 18 ( $\muονογενης$  Σεως, or  $vιoης$ ) ; on Acts 20 : 28 ( $\Sigma εοv$ , or  $\kappa vριov$ ) ; on Tit. 2 : 13, and 2 Pet. 1 : 1. But in a great majority of cases the result only was stated.

In order to form a just estimate of the American share of the work, and the degree of harmony of the two Committees, it is necessary to compare those parts which were done *independently*. For such an estimate we have the materials on hand.

When the communication between the two Committees was interrupted for a few months in 1877, the American Committee took up the first revision of a portion of Isaiah and of the Epistle to the Hebrews,

and finished them before the first English revision of the same books was received.

On a comparison it was found that in about one half of the changes the two Committees had arrived at the same conclusion. The result as to the Epistle to the Hebrews is more particularly stated in the following letter from the venerable Bishop Lee, D.D., LL.D., a member of the New Testament Company :

“WILMINGTON, Del., April 25, 1881.

“MY DEAR SIR : My examination of the independent revisions of the Epistle to the Hebrews by the English and the American Companies, resulted in the estimate that out of 913 changes made by the American Company, 476 were exactly coincident with those of the English. There were others substantially the same, but not precisely identical.

“The variations were largely in punctuation and minor points.

“I do not claim, of course, perfect accuracy, but I think this statement is not far from the truth.

“My estimate of the American suggestions adopted is, in

|                              |       |
|------------------------------|-------|
| The Gospels.....             | 318   |
| Acts .....                   | 186   |
| Epistles and Revelation..... | 400   |
|                              | <hr/> |
|                              | 904   |

“In the calculation I aimed to count each new suggestion but once, although in many cases it was often repeated—as *food for meat*, *hades for hell*, *tomb for sepulchre*, etc. I omitted returns to the Authorized Version, differences of punctuation, except in a few important instances, and metrical arrangements, presuming that these would have been done by the British Company even without our calling their attention to them.

“If you wish for more particular information upon any of these points, I shall be happy to supply it as far as I can.

“Very truly yours,

“ALFRED LEE.”

Again, in the year 1880, the American Old Testament Company went through the first revision of the Book of Job, and printed it (for private use) before the first English revision of the same book was received. Copies were transmitted by the President to the Secretary of the British Old Testament Company, February 4th, 1881, with the remark: “I send you to-day by European express twenty-seven copies of the American revision of Job, for distribution among the members of your Company. The revision was completed before your revision came to hand. Hence it has been printed in full, which will give you a better

idea of the character of our work and the measure of its agreement with yours."

A careful comparison was made between the English and the American revision of Job by the Rev. Professor Mead, of Andover, Mass., a member of the Old Testament Company, and the result is stated in the following letter addressed to the Chairman of the Old Testament Company :

“ ANDOVER, Feb. 5, 1881.

“ MY DEAR PROF. GREEN: . . . You may be interested in knowing the result of my collation of the two revisions of Job. Of course it is impossible to be very exact, it being often difficult to determine how to designate a change, or to decide how far to analyze a change—*i. e.*, whether to call it one, two, or three, when a whole clause is transformed. In general I have adopted the plan of being minute in the matter, though doubtless not consistent with myself either in this or in any other respect. Still the general proportion of things is probably indicated with tolerable exactness. The result is as follows :

Whole number of changes made by the Ameri-

can Revisers ..... 1781

Whole number of changes made by the English

Revisers ..... 1004

Changes identical in both ..... 455

|                                                |     |
|------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Changes substantially the same in both.....    | 134 |
| Passages differently changed by both .....     | 289 |
| Changes in A. R. where there are none in E. R. | 913 |
| Changes in E. R. where there are none in A. R. | 236 |
| American readings found in English margin...   | 53  |
| English readings found in American margin...   | 12  |

"The general result is that in about half the cases we coincide. More exactly: the identical changes form about  $45\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. of the changes made by the English. Adding the cases of substantial coincidence, we have made  $58\frac{2}{3}$  per cent. of the changes which they have made. In multitudes of other cases there would be a ready acquiescence on our part in their changes—many of them having reference to very small matters, while many of ours also are of a similar sort.

"Yours truly,

"C. M. MEAD."

On the basis of these facts it may be said that the two Committees, if they had acted independently, would have produced substantially the same work: about one half of all the changes, and these the most important, being identical; and the other half being mostly of such a nature, that they would have been readily acquiesced in by the other party.

Both Committees have, therefore, a perfect right

to look upon the revision as their own work. The English Committee, however, has a just claim to priority and a primacy of honor. The mother took the lead, the daughter followed. The Americans gave to the vast majority of the English changes their hearty approval, and the whole weight of their independent research and judgment. On the other hand, a large number of the remaining changes which they regarded as most important, have been, after due deliberation, accepted by the English, so that, with a few exceptions, the points of difference set forth in the Appendix are of *comparatively* little interest and importance.

As illustrations of these concessions made in the progress of the work, Bishop Lee furnishes me with the following partial list of the more important American suggestions on the Gospels, which have been adopted by the English Committee in the second revision. The same changes in the parallel pages are not counted.

#### VII.—SOME AMERICAN SUGGESTIONS ADOPTED.

Matthew i. 1. The genealogy, put in margin.

12. removal, put in margin.

22. For *of* the Lord *by* the prophet ; by, through ;  
and so 2 : 15.

Matt. ii. 23. shall : should be called.

iii. 3. prepare ye : make ye ready, and metrical arrangement.

4. meat : food ; and so in many places.

iv. 24. lunatic : epileptic ; and so elsewhere.

v. 15. candle, candlestick : lamp, stand ; and so in Luke 11 : 33.

25. lest : lest haply.

vi. Several paragraphs.

16. sour : sad.

19. dig through, in margin.

26. much better : of much more value.

vii. 9. of whom if his son shall ask bread ; who, if his son shall ask him for a loaf.

viii. 6. Gr. with a word in margin.

18. multitude : great multitudes ; other shore : other side ; and so *passim*.

ix. 8. authority, in margin.

31. country : land.

x. 21. and father shall deliver up child : and the father his child ; and so Mark 13:12 ; or put them to death, in margin ; do., and so Mark 13 : 12.

xi. 5. the gospel : good tidings ; and in Luke 7: 22.

7. to look upon : behold ; and Luke.

10. order : prepare.

17. Gr. beat the breast, in margin.

23. hell : hades ; and so *passim*.

xiii. 1. the whole : all the multitude ; shore : beach.

12. taken : taken away.

15. *Dele* should.

33. Margin is ; denotes.

Matt. xiii. 44. for joy thereof : in his joy.  
xiv. 19. sit down : recline, adopted in margin.  
26. in their fear : for fear.  
xvi. 9. *Dele* do ye.  
xvii. 4. or booths, in margin.  
xviii. 3. be converted : turn.  
22. seventy times and seven, put in margin, and  
seventy times seven in text.  
xix. 5. for this : for this cause.  
8. the hardness of your hearts : your hardness of  
heart ; and so in Mark 10 : 5.  
xx. 14. it pleaseth me : it is my will.  
xxi. 10. moved : stirred.  
24. thing : question ; marg., Gr. word.  
36. likewise : in like manner.  
42. this was the Lord's doing : this was from the  
Lord ; so in Mark 12 : 11.  
xxii. 13. ministers · proposed, attendants ; adopted, ser-  
vants.  
26. the seven : the seventh.  
43. spirit : Spirit.  
xxiii. 8. master : teacher.  
xxiv. 8. pains : suggested, pangs ; adopted, travail.  
xxvi. 16. betray : deliver.  
24. for him if that man had not been born : for that  
man if he had not been born.  
49. kissed him much, in margin.  
50. is it this for which thou art come ? do that for  
which, etc.  
58. begged : asked ; and so elsewhere.  
67. guilty : worthy of death.

Matt. xxvii. 61. there was there Mary Magdalene : and Mary Magdalene was there.

24. was made : was arising.

28. Some anc. auth. read clothed, margin.

44. cast the same in his teeth : cast upon him the same reproach.

xxviii. 11. were done : were come to pass.

In Matthew, 126 new suggestions adopted, not including returns to Authorized Version. New paragraphs counted.

Mark i. 43. solemnly : suggested, sternly, put in margin ; and strictly, in text.

ii. 3. carried : borne.

iii. 8. all the things : what great things.

iv. 30. place it : set it forth.

39. arose : awoke.

v. 3. among : in the tombs.

36. be not afraid : fear not.

vi. 2. the many : *del* the.

24. should : shall I ask.

54. they : *the people*.

vii. 6, 7. Metrically arranged.

ix. 3. such that no fuller . . . can so whiten them : so as no fuller . . . can whiten.

8. when they had looked : looking.

18. Substitute margin for text ; dasheth him down for rendeth him.

xii. 10. so much as this : even this.

xiii. 20. should : would.

35. either : whether.

xiv. 8. to : for the burying.

Mark xiv. 38. Add margin, Watch ye, and pray that ye enter not.

55. all the council : the whole council.

xv. 37. when he had uttered . . . gave up : uttered a loud voice, and gave up.

Forty-six new suggestions in Mark adopted.

Luke ii. 2. Quirinus : Quirinius.

9. stood over : stood by.

19. sayings : add margin, Or things.

35. pierce : pierce through.

49. about my Father's business, restored in margin.

iii. 8. your repentance : put in margin.

iv. 41. forbade : suffered them not.

vi. 35. Margin, some anc. auth. read, despairing of no man.

viii. 6. fell down : fell.

14. as they go : as they go on their way.

ix. 7. of : by, three times.

58. Margin, roosting places : lodging places.

x. 1. seventy and two : *dele* and two in text, and put it in margin.

41. careful : anxious.

xii. 11. unto : before.

46. faithless : unfaithful.

xiii. 4. debtors : offenders ; margin, Gr. debtors.

xiv. 1. chief Pharisees : rulers of the Pharisees.

23. compel : constrain.

xv. 7. just : righteous.

xvi. 2. mayest be : canst be.

3. I cannot dig : I have not strength to dig.

14. mocked : scoffed at.

Luke xvii. 2. profitable : gain ; adopted, well.

xviii. 9. the rest : all others.

xx. 16. God forbid : far be it, adopted in margin, Gr. be it not so.

xxi. 16. waves : swelling waves ; adopted, billows.

xxiii. 1. number : multitude ; adopted, company.

12. together : with each other.

35. derided : scoffed at.

55. sepulchre : tomb, and elsewhere, for *μνηστεῖον*.

xxiv. 22. made us astonished : amazed us.

New suggestions in Luke adopted, 62, not including returns to Authorized Version or metrical arrangements.

John i. 5. overcame : apprehended, from margin.

6. there was : there appeared ; adopted, came.

12. power : right, from margin.

15. spake : said.

18. God only begotten. Transpose text and margin.

33. IIHoly Ghost : IIHoly Spirit.

42. ( ) after Cephas.

ii. 10. Largely : freely. \*

19. etc. temple : margin, sanctuary.

.iv. 22. of the Jews : from the Jews.

25. tell : declare.

34. perfect : accomplish.

vi. 1. over : to the other side of.

23. in [ ].

39. all which : all that which.

66. after this : upon this.

vii. 16. doctrine : teaching.

John vii. 22. Add margin, Ye all marvel because of this.  
52. Transpose margin and Text.  
viii. 42. came out : came forth.  
xi. 12. he shall be saved : he will recover.  
20. Mary sat still : still sat.  
50. for to : that they might.  
xii. 28. from : out of heaven.  
xv. 3. even now : already.  
5. Transpose text and margin, apart from.  
xvi. 8. the world of sin : in respect of sin.  
xviii. 12. Add margin, Or military tribune, Gr. Chiliarch.  
18. stood : were standing.  
20. whether : where ; resort : come together.  
xix. 12. whosoever : every one that.  
30. the ghost : his spirit.  
42. Change of arrangement.  
xx. 17. Add margin, Take not hold on me.

New suggestions adopted in John, 84, not including returns to Authorized Version, or substitutions of who or that for which.

|               |     |
|---------------|-----|
| Matthew ..... | 126 |
| Mark .....    | 46  |
| Luke .....    | 62  |
| John.....     | 84  |
|               | 318 |

Bishop Lee wishes it to be understood that this list of American changes adopted is not complete.

## VIII.—THE POINTS OF AGREEMENT.

The changes in which the two Committees have agreed, and which distinguish the Revised English Testament from the Authorized Version, may be classified as follows :

1. The text. The oldest and purest attainable text of the uncial manuscripts is substituted for the received text of later cursive manuscripts. This includes omissions (with margin, as in Matt. 6:13; John 5:4; Acts 8:37; without margin, as in 1 John 5:7, 8), doubtful passages retained (as Mark 16:9–20; John 7:53–8:11), and changes (as in Matt. 19:17; Mark 3:29; Acts 18:5; Rom. 5:1; 1 Tim. 3:16; Rev. 17:8, and in a great many other passages).

2. Errors of typography, grammar, and translation are corrected. Examples : Matt. 10:4; 14:8; 15:27; 28:19; Luke 3:23; John 10:16; Acts 2:3, 47; 3:19, 20; 26:28; Rom. 3:25; 1 Cor. 4:4; Gal. 4:13; 1 Tim. 6:5; Heb. 11:13; 1 Pet. 3:21.

3. Inaccuracies in the rendering of the article, the moods and tenses, the prepositions, the particles, etc., are rectified.

4. Artificial distinctions caused by needless variations in rendering the same word and name are removed.

5. Real distinctions of the original text, which are obliterated by rendering two or more distinct terms in the same way, are restored.

6. Misleading and obsolete archaisms are replaced by intelligible words.

7. The words supplied in italics are revised and greatly reduced in number.

8. Sectional arrangement is combined with the arbitrary capitular and versicular division, which is put in the margin.

9. Poetical quotations from the Old Testament are arranged as poetry.

10. Alternate readings, as well as renderings, are given in the outside margin.

These improvements occur on every page, and almost in every verse ; but the majority of readers and hearers will scarcely observe them, and few of them alter the sense very materially. They may be compared in this respect to the 150,000 variations of the Greek Testament. They do not change a single article of faith, nor a single precept of duty. And yet in the Word of God every little thing is important, and every effort to bring our English Bible nearer to the Greek and Hebrew original is *thankworthy*.

In this vast mass of improvements, we may well say, in ninety-nine out of a hundred changes, the two Committees are agreed. This fact can scarcely be

overestimated. It is true, a very large proportion, we may say, at least one-half, of the changes had become common property among biblical scholars before the revision was undertaken. They had been anticipated by textual critics, as Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles (and the advance sheets of Westcott and Hort), by the revised translations of Alford, Noyes, Davidson, Weiszäcker, F. W. Gotch, Benj. Davies, G. A. Jacob, and Sam. G. Green, etc., and by the Commentaries of De Wette, Meyer, Lange (the American edition, which contains a revision of the A.V.), Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, and many others.\*

But the value of the Anglo-American Revision is that, after the most careful examination, it selects and

\* The Rev. Dr. Riddle, a member of the New Testament Company, and a contributor to the American edition of Lange's Commentary, after a careful comparison, has arrived at the conclusion that on an average more than one-half (from 50 to 75 per cent.) of the changes in the English Revision were anticipated in that Commentary, which was nearly completed (in the New Testament part) before the revision began. The percentage increased as the Commentary went on. It is greatest in the Gospel of John, the Epistle to the Romans, and the minor Pauline Epistles. We give here a few specimens of emendations which, according to Dr. Riddle, were adopted in the *first* English Revision, and anticipated in the American edition of Lange. The chapters were selected at random, but fairly represent the average.

authorizes the best of these modern improvements, together with many new ones, for the public benefit. It harvests the mature fruits of the critical and exegetical researches of whole generations. It divests the changes of personal merits and demerits, and gives to them a churchly and catholic character. It is a compromise: every member had to sacrifice some of his preferences to the views of the majority; but for this very reason it is more likely to prove generally acceptable to the churches.

Commentary on Matthew (published in 1864):

Chap. XXV., 62 changes by Revisers, 30 anticipated in Lange.

Commentary on John (published 1871):

Chap. VII., 85 changes by Revisers, 60 anticipated in Lange.

Chap. XI., 111 changes by Revisers, 79 anticipated in Lange.

Commentary on Ephesians (published 1870):

Chap. I., 42 changes by Revisers, 35 anticipated in Lange.

Chap. II., 55 changes by Revisers, 37 anticipated in Lange.

Chap. III., 60 changes by Revisers, 36 anticipated in Lange.

Chap. IV., 55 changes by Revisers, 43 anticipated in Lange.

Chap. V., 64 changes by Revisers, 48 anticipated in Lange.

Chap. VI., 38 changes by Revisers, 30 anticipated in Lange.

In Romans (published 1869), and Galatians (published 1870), the correspondence is at times even greater.

## IX.—THE AMERICAN APPENDIX.

The American Appendix is short, and contains only those renderings which the English Company, in its final action, was unwilling to accept, and which the American Committee deemed of sufficient importance to be recorded for future use. It is provided for by the fourth article of the agreement of Aug. 3, 1877, which is as follows :

“(4.) If any differences shall still remain, the American Committee will yield its preferences for the sake of harmony ; provided that such differences of reading and rendering as the American Committee may represent to the English Companies to be of special importance, be distinctly stated either in the Preface to the Revised Version, or in an Appendix to the volume, during a term of fourteen years from the date of publication, unless the American Churches shall sooner pronounce a deliberate opinion upon the Revised Version with the view of its being taken for public use.”

The Appendix was originally much larger, but has been gradually reduced, by honorable and liberal concessions of both parties. The best part of the American labor is incorporated in the book ; and there it will remain, whatever may become of the Appendix.

The remaining differences are still more reduced when we consider that the English Revisers have

recognized on the margin many of the American changes.

The American renderings, if judged by the Greek text, may be traced chiefly to greater fidelity and consistency. The revision must be faithful first to the original Scriptures, and next to the idiom and vocabulary of the Authorized Version. Sometimes these two kinds of loyalty come into conflict. In unimportant or doubtful cases the English Revisers allowed their regard for the old version and for English usage to overrule their regard for the Greek text, and felt bound to do so by the Canterbury rules. This is very natural, if we remember that the old version is largely incorporated into the liturgical and devotional literature, and that the Book of Common Prayer is a greater power in England than in the United States. The American editions of the Prayer-Book depart from the English editions in some of the disputed particulars of language, for instance in the change of "which" to "who" in the Lord's Prayer.

The American Appendix then represents closer adherence to the Greek, and greater freedom from old English usage.

## X.—POINTS OF VARIATION.

I have no space, nor is it necessary to explain in detail the American Appendix. But I shall give the reasons for the most important changes which cover a number of passages.

## I. THE TITLES AND HEADINGS OF BOOKS.

i. Omit the word “Saint” from the title of the Gospels and the Revelation of John, the word “the Apostle” from the title of the Pauline Epistles, and “Paul the Apostle” from the Epistle to the Hebrews, the word “General” from the title of the Epistles of James, Peter, 1 John, and Jude.

The reasons for these omissions are as follows :

(a.) There is no authority for the title “Saint” in the old Greek mss., which read simply, “According to Matthew” (*Kατὰ Ματθαῖον*), or “Gospel according to Matthew.” (*Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μ.*), or in latter mss., “The Holy Gospel according to Matthew,” etc.

(b.) The technical ecclesiastical use of “Saint,” as one of a spiritual nobility distinct from ordinary Christians, is not biblical, but dates from a later age. In the New Testament the term is applied to all believers, as being separated from the world, consecrated to God and destined for holiness. See Rom.

1 : 7 ; 12 : 13 ; 16 : 15 ; 1 Pet. 2 : 9 ; Acts 9 : 13, 32, 41 ; Jude, ver. 3. The Apostles and their disciples are simply called by their names.

(c.) The Authorized Version is inconsistent in prefixing the title "Saint" to the Gospels and to Revelation, but omitting it in the Acts and Epistles, as if James, Peter, and Paul were not saints as well as Matthew, Mark, and Luke ; or as if the St. John of the Gospel and of the Revelation were not the same as the John of the Epistles. The inconsistency is, of course, an inadvertency. The Bishops' Bible retained the title "Saint" from the Vulgate in twenty-six books of the New Testament ; the Geneva Bible of 1560 omitted it in all ; the first edition of the Authorized Version of 1611 omitted it in all but five.

(d.) The title "Apostle" is likewise wanting in the oldest Greek mss., which read simply, "To the Romans" ( $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma$  'P $\omega$ μαίοντ $\varsigma$ ), etc., although some insert "of Paul," or "of the Apostle Paul," or "of the holy Apostle Paul." Moreover, the title "Apostle" belongs to Peter and John as well as to Paul, and should be given to all or none.

(e.) The present title of the Epistle to the Hebrews ("the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews") prejudices the open question of the authorship of this anonymous Epistle. The best mss. read simply,

“The Epistle to the Hebrews” (*ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραιοὺς ἐπιστολὴ*).

(f.) The title “General” (Catholic) of the Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude is likewise of later date, and omitted by critical editors. It is also misleading, and applies no more to those Epistles than to the Ephesians and the Hebrews, which have an encyclical character; while the second and third Epistles of John are addressed to an individual.

An objection will be made to this part of the Appendix by those who deem it reverent to retain the time-honored “Saint” in connection with the Evangelists and Apostles. But then, let us at least be consistent, and use it uniformly or drop it altogether. The sacred writers must be our standard of reverence, and they speak of each other simply as Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Paul. The highest order of merit and distinction needs no epithet of honor.

## 2. ARCHAIC FORMS.

Substitute modern forms of speech for the following archaisms—viz., “who” or “that” for “which” when used of persons; “are” for “be” in the present indicative; “know,” “knew,” for “wot,” “wist”; “drag” or “drag away” for “hale.”

There is a difference between misleading and in-

nocent archaisms. The British Committee acts on the principle of removing the former and retaining the latter; the American Committee removes the latter also, in those cases where they are either unintelligible or offend against the present rules of grammar.

The Revision has justly changed such words and phrases as "to prevent" for "precede" (1 Thess. 4:15; Matt. 17:25, "spake first"); "to let" for "to hinder" (Rom. 1:13; 2 Thess. 2:7); "to fetch a compass" for "to make a circuit," or "to go round" (Acts 28:13); "conversation" for "conduct," or "manner of life" (Gal. 1:13; Eph. 4:22, etc.); "atonement" for "reconciliation" (Rom. 5:12); "ambassage" for "embassy" (Luke 14:32); "carriages" for "baggage" (Acts 21:15); "damnation" for "condemnation," or "judgment" (Rom. 13:2; 1 Cor. 11:29); "coast" for "border," or "region"; "by-and-by" for "immediately"; "instantly" for "urgently," and many others.

Why, then, not go a little further? "To hale," in the sense "to drag forcibly," is certainly obsolete or misleading, at least in America, but has been retained in Luke 12:58; Acts 8:3. "Wot" for "know," and "wist" for "knew" (Mark 14:40), and "to wit" for "to know" are no longer in use, and the last

phrase has been abandoned by the Revision (2 Cor. 8:1), for "We make known to you" (instead of "We do you to wit").

The cases of "which" for "who" when used of persons, and "be" for "are" in the present indicative, are very frequent, and although quite harmless because not liable to misunderstanding, might as well have been consistently removed in all passages, as has been actually done in a great many. Why should we perpetuate a conflict between the language of the school and the language of the Church? Why censure a schoolboy for following the Bible? We lose no word by the change, since "which" in its proper place, for the neuter gender and for the interrogative, is retained, and is just as good new English as "who" is good old English.

But these are matters of national taste. I heard Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright say that they would rather pray "Our Father *which* art in heaven," than "*who* art in heaven." So the strict German Lutherans always address God, not in the more correct modern style, "*Unser Vater*" (although Luther so translated the Lord's Prayer in Matt. 6:9), but in the old-fashioned and now ungrammatical form, "*Vater unser*" which Luther retained in his Catechism, in accordance with the Latin "*Pater noster*."

## 3. RENDERING OF TERMS DENOTING COINS.

Let *ἀσσαρίον* (Matt. 10:29; Luke 12:6) be translated “penny,” and *δηνάριον* “shilling,” except in Matt. 22:19; Mark 12:15; Luke 20:24, where the name of the coin, “a denarius,” should be given.

The rendering of coins in our English Version is very objectionable, and makes a false impression upon the popular reader. “Mite” may be retained for *λεπτόν* (the eighth part of an *ἀσσαρίον*, or *as*, half a *quadrans*, or about one-fifth of one cent), and “farthing” for *κοδράντης* (*quadrans*, the fourth part of an *as*, equivalent to two mites, *δύο λεπτά*), as in Mark 12:42, “a poor widow cast in two mites which make a farthing.” But the more valuable coins are mischievously perverted and belittled. Bishop Lightfoot, one of the English Revisers, has shown this so well that we can do no better than quote him in full justification of the American view. He says:\*

“Why *ἀσσαρίον*, the late Greek diminutive used for the *as*, of which, therefore, the *κοδράντης* is a fourth part, should still be translated a *farthing* (which elsewhere represents *κοδράντης*) rather than *penny*, it is difficult to see (Matt. 10:29; Luke 12:

\* In his excellent book, “A Fresh Revision of the English New Testament,” London, 1871, Am. ed. (Harpers), 1873, pp. 141-143.

6). And as we advance in the scale, the disproportion between the value of the original and the English substitute increases. Thus the *denarius*, a silver piece of the value originally of ten and afterward of sixteen ases, is always rendered a *penny*. Its absolute value, as so much weight in metal, is as nearly as possible the same as the French franc. Its relative value as a purchasing power, in an age and a country where provisions were much cheaper, was considerably more. Now it so happens that in almost every case where the word  $\delta\eta\rho\alpha\rho\iota\sigma$  occurs in the New Testament it is connected with the idea of a *liberal* or *large* amount ; and yet in these passages the English rendering names a sum which is absurdly small. Thus the Good Samaritan, whose generosity is intended to appear throughout, on leaving, takes out ‘two pence,’ and gives them to the inn-keeper to supply the further wants of the wounded man. Thus, again, the owner of the vineyard, whose liberality is contrasted with the niggardly, envious spirit, the ‘evil eye’ of others, gives, as a day’s wages, ‘a penny’ to each man. It is unnecessary to ask what impression the mention of this sum will leave on the minds of an uneducated peasant or shopkeeper of the present day. Even at the time when our Version was made, and when wages were lower, it must have seemed wholly inadequate. The inadequacy again

appears, though not so prominently, in ‘the two hundred pence,’ the sum named as insufficient to supply bread to the five thousand (Mark 6 : 37 ; John 6 : 7), and similarly in other cases (*e.g.*, Mark 14 : 5 ; John 12 : 5 ; Luke 7 : 41). Lastly, in the Book of the Revelation (6 : 6), the announcement, which in the original implies famine prices, is rendered in our English Version, ‘A measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny.’ The fact is that the word *χοῖνιξ*, here translated ‘measure,’ falls below the amount of a quart, while the word *δηνάριον*, here translated ‘a penny,’ approaches toward the value of a shilling. To the English reader the words must convey the idea of enormous plenty.”

The judgment of the best English scholars is entirely in our favor. If the “penny,” which occurs in no less than sixteen passages, was nevertheless retained (although with a correction in the margin), it must be traced partly to an over-conservative regard for popular usage, and partly to the difficulty of finding a precise idiomatic equivalent for the Greek *δηνάριον* (Latin *denarius*). Sometimes a little matter gives most trouble. This is an instance. The penny was discussed over and over again in both Committees. In the English Company at an early stage the Anglicized form “denāry” was about to be adopted, when the late Dean Alford killed it by the humorous

objection that “denary” might be mispronounced “deanery,” and give rise to the jest that the Revisers sold a deanery for a penny. The precise rendering would be “eight pence,” but this is no single coin. “Six pence” in this respect would do better, but falls short of the full value. Still less would Englishmen tolerate “sixteen cents,” nor would Americans think of intruding their coins into the Bible. But they considered repeatedly the claims of “shilling,” “franc,” “silverling,” “drachma,” “denarius,” “denary,” “denar.” The Latin “denarius” would have been adopted throughout, if it were not for the passages where the word occurs in the plural (Mark 6 : 37; 14 : 5; Luke 7 : 41; 10 : 35; John 6 : 7; 12 : 5); for *dñarii* sounds too much like Latin for an English Bible. They agreed at last upon “shilling,” but would prefer any other of the proposed renderings to “penny.” A shilling is not absolutely correct, but is a genuine English silver coin, and does not convey the wrong idea of a ridiculously small sum. There can be no doubt whatever that, if found in the old version, it would have been retained by both Committees.

#### 4. MORE ACCURATE RENDERINGS.

(a.) Put into the text uniformly the marginal rendering “through” in place of “by,” when it relates to prophecy—

viz., in Matt. 2 : 5, 17, 23; 3 : 3; 4 : 14; 8 : 17; 12 : 17; 13 : 35; 21 : 4; 24 : 15; 27 : 9; Luke 18 : 31; Acts 2 : 16; 28 : 25.

This is important to indicate the difference of the primary and secondary authorship of prophecy, which is given by the Holy Spirit *through* the prophet ( $\deltaι\alpha\tauο\check{\nu}\pi\rhoοφi\tauο\check{v}$ ).

(b.) Let the word “testament” be everywhere changed to “covenant” (without an alternate in the margin), except in Heb. 9 : 15-17.

It is well known that  $\deltaι\alpha\vartheta\eta\mu\eta$  in Hellenistic Greek means usually *covenant* (corresponding to the Hebrew *berith*), except, perhaps, in Heb. 9 : 15-17, and also in Gal. 3 : 15, but even in these passages the same meaning is preferred by many commentators. The translation “testament” in the English Version (Matt. 26 : 28, etc.), in accordance with the Vulgate, gave rise to the designation of the “Old and New Testament” (instead of “Covenant”), which is especially improper in the case of the Old Testament. The American Committee thought at first of proposing also a change of the title, but gave it up, as “Old and New Testament” have assumed a settled meaning in all translations of the Bible, and hardly could be changed.

(c.) Substitute “demon” or “demons” for “devil” or “devils,” where the Greek has  $\deltaαιμων$  or  $\deltaαιμόνιον$ , as in

the phrases “to cast out devils,” “to be possessed with a devil,” “to have a devil.”

The Bible knows only of *one* devil, but of a great many evil spirits. The English Revision acknowledges the distinction in the margin, but not in the text, which will continue to mislead the reader not acquainted with Greek.

The two Committees had a similar conflict about “hades” and “hell.” The Americans insisted from the start on the restoration of the important distinction between *hades*, *i. e.*, the spirit-world or the realm of the dead, and *gehenna*, *i. e.*, the state and place of torment, or hell—a distinction which is obliterated in King James’ Version, so that the fearful word *hell* occurs twice as often in it as it does in the Greek Testament. The English Revisers, from conservative regard to old usage, opposed the insertion of “hades” and persistently retained “hell” until they reached the Apocalypse, when the American suggestion was adopted. Habit is strong, but truth is stronger, and will prevail at last.

#### CONCLUSION.

The Appendix is subject to the verdict of the American Christian community. If approved by public opinion, it will ultimately be incorporated in

the text of the American editions ; if not, it will still retain a certain literary and historical value. The American Bible Society, with its present constitution, is confined to the circulation of the Authorized English Version, and cannot publish the Revision. But this constitution can be changed, and will be changed whenever the churches which support the Society adopt the Revision. Then will be the proper time to make the American Appendix practically available, if deemed wise and expedient. This will not be the issue of a rival Revision, but only an American recension of one and the same Revision : and the changes will no more affect the unity of the Revision than the differences of English and American spelling now affect the unity of the English language. On the contrary, the essential unity will be all the more apparent and effective for the variety in unessential details. Worshipers of the letter may take offense, but worshipers of the spirit of the Bible will rejoice.

But whatever may be the ultimate fate of the American Appendix, it is of very little account as compared with the substantial agreement. It is a matter of wonder and congratulation that two Committees, divided by the ocean and representing two independent and high-minded nations sensitive of their honor, should, after several years of unbroken and conscientious labor, have arrived at such a substantial har-

mony in the translation of their most sacred book, which is recognized by both as their infallible guide in all matters of Christian faith and duty.

The Anglo-American Revision is the noblest monument of Christian union and co-operation in this nineteenth century.

And herein is the finger of Providence, and the best guarantee of success.

# INDEX OF TEXTS.

---

**MATTHEW.**

PAGE

|       |      |     |     |       |
|-------|------|-----|-----|-------|
| i.    | 1    | ... | ... | 17    |
| ii.   | 1    | ... | ... | 113   |
|       | 2    | ... | ... | 94    |
|       | 4    | ... | ... | 91    |
|       | 15   | ... | ... | 95    |
|       | 17   | ... | ... | 112   |
| iii.  | 14   | ... | ... | 98    |
|       | 17   | ... | ... | 12    |
| iv.   | 1    | ... | ... | 131   |
|       | 6    | ... | ... | 144   |
|       | 19   | ... | ... | 144   |
| v.    | 4    | ... | ... | 137   |
|       | 8, 9 | ... | ... | 6     |
|       | 22   | ... | ... | 48    |
|       | 29   | ... | ... | 108   |
|       | 40   | ... | ... | 127   |
|       | 48   | ... | ... | 99    |
| vi.   | 13   | ... | ... | 8, 60 |
|       | 34   | ... | ... | 109   |
| vii.  | 13   | ... | ... | 102   |
| viii. | 5    | ... | ... | 137   |
|       | 6    | ... | ... | 123   |
|       | 20   | ... | ... | 93    |
|       | 33   | ... | ... | 13    |
| ix.   | 4    | ... | ... | 75    |
|       | 14   | ... | ... | 144   |

**MATTHEW (*continued*).**

PAGE

|    |        |     |     |     |
|----|--------|-----|-----|-----|
| x. | 22     | ... | ... | 144 |
|    | xi.    | 19  | ... | 144 |
|    | xii.   | 41  | ... | 133 |
|    |        | 47  | ... | 7   |
|    | xiii.  | 16  | ... | 10  |
|    |        | 21  | ... | 108 |
|    |        | 47  | ... | 137 |
|    |        | 52  | ... | 130 |
|    | xiv.   | 2   | ... | 128 |
|    |        | 8   | ... | 76  |
|    |        | 19  | ... | 50  |
|    | xv.    | 27  | ... | 76  |
|    | xvi.   | 14  | ... | 112 |
|    |        | 23  | ... | 108 |
|    | xvii.  | 4   | ... | 13  |
|    |        | 5   | ... | 148 |
|    |        | 10  | ... | 112 |
|    |        | 19  | ... | 144 |
|    |        | 24  | ... | 115 |
|    |        | 25  | ... | 107 |
|    |        | 27  | ... | 115 |
|    | xviii. | 17  | ... | 48  |
|    |        | 28  | ... | 8   |
|    | xix.   | 7   | ... | 144 |
|    |        | 20  | ... | 95  |
|    | xx.    | 24  | ... | 148 |

MATTHEW (*continued*)

PAGE

|            |        |     |            |
|------------|--------|-----|------------|
| xx. 27     | ...    | ... | 148        |
| xxii. 37   | ...    | ... | 119        |
| xxiii. 7   | ...    | ... | 148        |
|            | 24     | ... | 116        |
|            | 33     | ... | 133        |
|            | 35     | ... | 122        |
| xxiv. 24   | ...    | ... | 127        |
|            | 30     | ... | 103        |
|            | 40, 41 | ... | 99         |
| xxv. 3     | ...    | ... | 10         |
|            | 6      | ... | 18, 49, 97 |
|            | 27     | ... | 108        |
|            | 46     | ... | 140        |
| xxvi. 15   | ...    | ... | 77         |
|            | 25     | ... | 148        |
|            | 26     | ... | 53         |
|            | 41     | ... | 144        |
|            | 49     | ... | 149        |
| xxvii. 3   | ...    | ... | 124        |
|            | 9      | ... | 112        |
|            | 45     | ... | 139        |
|            | 57     | ... | 130        |
| xxviii. 19 | ...    | ... | 103        |
|            | 9—20   | ... | 130        |

## MARK.

|         |     |     |     |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|
| i. 2    | ... | ... | 10  |
| ii. 11  | ... | ... | 12  |
| ii. 17  | ... | ... | 144 |
| ii. 27  | ... | ... | 47  |
| iii. 5  | ... | ... | 82  |
| iii. 18 | ... | ... | 75  |
| iv. 29  | ... | ... | 77  |
| v. 30   | ... | ... | 103 |
| v. 41   | ... | ... | 76  |
| vi. 3   | ... | ... | 113 |
| vi. 5   | ... | ... | 127 |
| vi. 14  | ... | ... | 127 |

MARK (*continued*)

PAGE

|          |        |     |     |
|----------|--------|-----|-----|
| vi. 20   | ...    | ... | 49  |
|          | 27     | ... | 114 |
|          | 52     | ... | 82  |
| ix. 3    | ...    | ... | 46  |
|          | 5      | ... | 13  |
|          | 7      | ... | 148 |
|          | 22, 23 | ... | 49  |
|          | 24     | ... | 46  |
|          | 28     | ... | 144 |
|          | 39     | ... | 128 |
| x. 4     | ...    | ... | 144 |
|          | 41     | ... | 148 |
|          | 44     | ... | 148 |
|          | 51     | ... | 149 |
| xii. 6   | ...    | ... | 148 |
|          | 26     | ... | 30  |
|          | 40     | ... | 133 |
| xiii. 13 | ...    | ... | 144 |
|          | 32     | ... | 127 |
| xiv. 38  | ...    | ... | 144 |
| xv. 33   | ...    | ... | 138 |
|          | 45     | ... | 149 |
| xvi. 16  | ...    | ... | 133 |
|          | 9—20   | ... | 61  |

## LUKE.

|         |     |     |     |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|
| i. 59   | ... | ... | 98  |
|         | 63  | ... | 103 |
| ii. 33  | ... | ... | 15  |
|         | 41  | ... | 15  |
| iii. 14 | ... | ... | 92  |
|         | 23  | ... | 77  |
| iv. 10  | ... | ... | 144 |
|         | 20  | ... | 110 |
| v. 6    | ... | ... | 98  |
|         | 18  | ... | 148 |
| vi. 15  | ... | ... | 76  |
|         | 19  | ... | 108 |

LUKE (*continued*).

PAGE

|           |     |     |     |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----|
| vii. 34   | ... | ... | 144 |
| viii. 23  | ... | ... | 98  |
| 34        | ... | ... | 13  |
| 46        | ... | ... | 108 |
| 54        | ... | ... | 76  |
| ix. 5     | ... | ... | 144 |
| 32        | ... | ... | 78  |
| 33        | ... | ... | 13  |
| 58        | ... | ... | 93  |
| x. 48     | ... | ... | 107 |
| 51        | ... | ... | 122 |
| xiii. 2   | ... | ... | 94  |
| xiv. 10   | ... | ... | 107 |
| xv. 10    | ... | ... | 124 |
| 26        | ... | ... | 123 |
| xvi. 9    | ... | ... | 50  |
| xviii. 12 | ... | ... | 78  |
| xix. 13   | ... | ... | 108 |
| xx. 37    | ... | ... | 30  |
| xxii. 56  | ... | ... | 78  |
| xxiii. 5  | ... | ... | 113 |
| 8         | ... | ... | 127 |
| 42        | ... | ... | 102 |
| 44        | ... | ... | 139 |
| xxiv. 17  | ... | ... | 50  |
| 25        | ... | ... | 79  |
| 46        | ... | ... | 50  |
| 53        | ... | ... | 9   |

JOHN.

|         |     |     |     |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|
| i. 11   | ... | ... | 117 |
| 21      | ... | ... | 93  |
| 38      | ... | ... | 148 |
| 42      | ... | ... | 112 |
| iii. 16 | ... | ... | 119 |
| 17, 18  | ... | ... | 133 |
| iv. 31  | ... | ... | 148 |

JOHN (*continued*).

PAGE

|                 |     |     |          |
|-----------------|-----|-----|----------|
| iv. 37          | ... | ... | 93       |
| 48              | ... | ... | 127      |
| v. 3, 4         | ... | ... | 7        |
| 33              | ... | ... | 97       |
| vi. 11          | ... | ... | 50       |
| 32              | ... | ... | 93       |
| 50              | ... | ... | 18       |
| 57              | ... | ... | 101      |
| vii. 1          | ... | ... | 113      |
| 17              | ... | ... | 127      |
| 20              | ... | ... | 130      |
| 41              | ... | ... | 99       |
| 53—viii. 11     | ... | ... | 63       |
| viii. 33        | ... | ... | 97       |
| 52              | ... | ... | 18       |
| 58              | ... | ... | 129      |
| ix. 17          | ... | ... | 79       |
| x. 14, 15       | ... | ... | 79       |
| 16              | ... | ... | 120      |
| 23              | ... | ... | 122      |
| xi. 3, 5        | ... | ... | 119      |
| 20              | ... | ... | 80       |
| xii. 40         | ... | ... | 82       |
| xiii. 2         | ... | ... | 131      |
| 10              | ... | ... | 125      |
| 24              | ... | ... | 51       |
| xvii. 3         | ... | ... | 91       |
| 12              | ... | ... | 128      |
| xx. 2           | ... | ... | 119      |
| 16              | ... | ... | 51, 149  |
| xxi. 15, 16, 17 | ... | ... | 112, 118 |
| 18, 19          | ... | ... | 96       |

ACTS.

|       |     |     |     |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|
| i. 13 | ... | ... | 76  |
| ii. 3 | ... | ... | 80  |
| 11    | ... | ... | 112 |

*Index of Texts.*

| ACTS ( <i>continued</i> ).<br>PAGE |     |     | ROMANS.<br>PAGE |     |          |
|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----------------|-----|----------|
| ii. 27                             | ... | 116 | i. 13           | ... | 106      |
| iii. 13, 26                        | ... | 123 | 29              | ... | 108      |
| 19, 20                             | ... | 80  | ii. 22          | ... | 149      |
| iv. 27, 30                         | ... | 123 | iii. 25         | ... | 81       |
| v. 20                              | ... | 122 | iv. 3, &c.      | ... | 140, 142 |
| vii. 13                            | ... | 137 | 19              | ... | 52       |
| 45                                 | ... | 113 | v. 1            | ... | 52       |
| viii. 9                            | ... | 129 | vi. 2           | ... | 134      |
| 16                                 | ... | 103 | vii. 6          | ... | 52       |
| 37                                 | ... | 8   | 7, 8            | ... | 141      |
| x. 38                              | ... | 132 | viii. 1         | ... | 11       |
| xii. 4                             | ... | 116 | xi. 7, 25       | ... | 82       |
| 12, 25                             | ... | 112 | 30              | ... | 125      |
| xiii. 7, 8, 12                     | ... | 114 | xii. 2          | ... | 131      |
| xiv. 21                            | ... | 130 | 17              | ... | 107      |
| xv. 23                             | ... | 51  | 19              | ... | 143, 148 |
| xvi. 1                             | ... | 112 | xiv. 4          | ... | 10       |
| 7                                  | ... | 51  | 23              | ... | 133      |
| 21                                 | ... | 130 | xv. 6           | ... | 151      |
| 23, 27                             | ... | 151 | 30              | ... | 102      |
| xvii. 19                           | ... | 113 | xvi. 5          | ... | 52       |
| 23                                 | ... | 108 | 23              | ... | 114      |
| 28                                 | ... | 138 | I CORINTHIANS.  |     |          |
| xviii. 5                           | ... | 51  | i. 13           | ... | 103      |
| xix. 2                             | ... | 95  | iii. 17         | ... | 138      |
| 9                                  | ... | 93  | iv. 3, 4, 5     | ..  | 133      |
| 11                                 | ... | 128 | 4               | ... | 82       |
| 31                                 | ... | 114 | 13              | ... | 18       |
| 37                                 | ... | 149 | vi. 20          | ... | 11       |
| 38                                 | ... | 114 | vii. 26         | ... | 102      |
| xx. 28                             | ... | 14  | viii. 6         | ... | 103      |
| xxi. 15                            | ... | 109 | x. 2            | ... | 103      |
| xxii. 28                           | ... | 127 | 24              | ... | 107      |
| xxv. 26                            | ... | 133 | xi. 24          | ... | 53       |
| xxvi. 13                           | ... | 134 | 26              | ... | 53       |
| 24, 25                             | ... | 147 | 29              | ... | 53, 107  |
| 28                                 | ... | 81  | 31              | ... | 133      |
| xxviii. 13                         | ... | 110 |                 |     |          |

*Index of Texts.*

211

**1 CORINTHIANS (continued).**

|         | PAGE |
|---------|------|
| xii. 6  | 18   |
| 29      | 128  |
| xiii. 3 | 53   |
| 12      | 126  |
| xiv. 20 | 122  |
| xv. 4   | 96   |
| xvi. 15 | 52   |

**2 CORINTHIANS.**

|            |     |
|------------|-----|
| i. 1       | 112 |
| 4, 6       | 142 |
| 19         | 112 |
| 20         | 47  |
| ii. 14     | 83  |
| 16         | 149 |
| iii. 5     | 149 |
| 14         | 82  |
| 15         | 92  |
| 15, 18     | 142 |
| 17         | 93  |
| iv. 3      | 142 |
| v. 10      | 100 |
| 14         | 134 |
| 21         | 110 |
| vi. 9      | 126 |
| vii. 8, 10 | 124 |
| 11         | 93  |
| x. 15, 16  | 150 |
| xii. 19    | 54  |

**GALATIANS.**

|        |     |
|--------|-----|
| iii. 6 | 142 |
| iv. 8  | 148 |
| 14     | 54  |
| 17     | 107 |
| 31     | 92  |
| v. 17  | 84  |

**EPHESIANS.**

|       | PAGE |
|-------|------|
| i. 7  | 13   |
| 9     | 145  |
| 17    | 126  |
| ii. 2 | 125  |
| iv. 2 | 145  |
| 6     | 145  |
| 18    | 82   |
| 29    | 84   |
| v. 1  | 148  |
| 29    | 54   |
| vi. 5 | 145  |
| 12    | 110  |

**PHILIPPIANS.**

|           |     |
|-----------|-----|
| i. 16, 17 | 54  |
| ii. 6     | 30  |
| 15        | 99  |
| iii. 5    | 92  |
| 20        | 107 |
| iv. 2, 3  | 85  |
| 8         | 107 |

**COLOSSIANS.**

|         |     |
|---------|-----|
| i. 14   | 13  |
| ii. 2   | 65  |
| 8       | 85  |
| 12      | 145 |
| 18      | 54  |
| 19      | 145 |
| iii. 12 | 145 |
| 17      | 151 |
| 22      | 145 |

|        |     |
|--------|-----|
| iv. 10 | 112 |
| 14     | 112 |

**1 THESSALONIANS.**

|        |    |
|--------|----|
| i. 1   | 55 |
| ii. 19 | 55 |

*Index of Texts.*1 THESSALONIANS (*continued*).  
PAGE

|         |     |     |     |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|
| iii. 11 | ... | ... | 55  |
| 13      | ... | ... | 55  |
| iv. 15  | ... | ... | 107 |
| v. 28   | ... | ... | 55  |

## 2 THESSALONIANS.

|       |     |     |         |
|-------|-----|-----|---------|
| i. 2  | ... | ... | 55      |
| 12    | ... | ... | 55      |
| ii. 1 | ... | ... | 85      |
| 3     | ... | ... | 91      |
| 7     | ... | ... | 106     |
| 8     | ... | ... | 55, 134 |

## 1 TIMOTHY.

|         |     |     |        |
|---------|-----|-----|--------|
| i. 4    | ... | ... | 6      |
| 12      | ... | ... | 55     |
| 14      | ... | ... | 55     |
| ii. 5   | ... | ... | 55     |
| 7       | ... | ... | 151    |
| iii. 13 | ... | ... | 55     |
| 16      | ... | ... | 19, 66 |
| iv. 6   | ... | ... | 55     |
| v. 4    | ... | ... | 108    |
| 21      | ... | ... | 55     |
| vi. 5   | ... | ... | 86     |
| 8       | ... | ... | 99     |
| 9       | ... | ... | 127    |
| 10      | ... | ... | 92     |
| 12, 13  | ... | ... | 151    |
| 13      | ... | ... | 55     |

## 2 TIMOTHY.

|      |     |     |    |
|------|-----|-----|----|
| i. 1 | ... | ... | 55 |
| 2    | ... | ... | 56 |
| 9    | ... | ... | 56 |
| 13   | ... | ... | 56 |

2 TIMOTHY (*continued*).  
PAGE

|         |     |     |     |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|
| 3       | ... | ... | 55  |
| 10      | ... | ... | 56  |
| 12      | ... | ... | 139 |
| iii. 12 | ... | ... | 56  |
| 15      | ... | ... | 56  |
| v. 11   | ... | ... | 112 |

## TITUS.

|    |     |     |     |
|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 4  | ... | ... | 55  |
| 12 | ... | ... | 112 |

## PHILEMON.

|    |     |     |     |
|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 2  | ... | ... | 56  |
| 7  | ... | ... | 56  |
| 24 | ... | ... | 112 |

## HEBREWS.

|          |     |     |        |
|----------|-----|-----|--------|
| i. 3     | ... | ... | 134    |
| iii. 11  | ... | ... | 143    |
| iv. 2    | ... | ... | 56     |
| 3, 5     | ... | ... | 143    |
| 6        | ... | ... | 125    |
| 8        | ... | ... | 113    |
| 12       | ... | ... | 107    |
| 14       | ... | ... | 103    |
| vi. 7    | ... | ... | 101    |
| ix. 6    | ... | ... | 99     |
| x. 30    | ... | ... | 143    |
| 34       | ... | ... | 56     |
| xi. 10   | ... | ... | 91     |
| 13       | ... | ... | 56, 86 |
| 23       | ... | ... | 108    |
| xii. 1   | ... | ... | 110    |
| 12       | ... | ... | 148    |
| xiii. 21 | ... | ... | 112    |

## JAMES.

|      |     |     |     |
|------|-----|-----|-----|
| i. 6 | ... | ... | 131 |
|------|-----|-----|-----|

*Index of Texts.*

213

| JAMES ( <i>continued</i> ).<br>PAGE |     |        | 2 JOHN.<br>PAGE |     |         |
|-------------------------------------|-----|--------|-----------------|-----|---------|
| i. 19                               | ... | 57     | 8               | ... | 57      |
| ii. 1                               | ... | 111    |                 |     |         |
| 2                                   | ... | 150    |                 |     |         |
| iii. 1                              | ... | 111    |                 |     |         |
| v. 20                               | ... | 93     | 12              | ... | 57      |
| 1 PETER.                            |     |        | JUDE.           |     |         |
| i. 3                                | ... | 151    | 1               | ... | 58, 114 |
| ii. 8                               | ... | 125    | 8               | ... | 145     |
| 21                                  | ... | 57     | 13              | ... | 145     |
| iii. 11                             | ... | 107    |                 |     |         |
| 15                                  | ... | 68     |                 |     |         |
| 21                                  | ... | 87     |                 |     |         |
| iv. 8                               | ... | 93     |                 |     |         |
| v. 1                                | ... | 137    |                 |     |         |
| 13                                  | ... | 112    |                 |     |         |
| 2 PETER.                            |     |        | REVELATION.     |     |         |
| i. 3                                | ... | 102    | i. 3            | ... | 93      |
| 14                                  | ... | 95     | ii. 13          | ... | 139     |
| ii. 10                              | ... | 145    | iv. 1           | ... | 10      |
| 17                                  | ... | 145    | 4               | ... | 139     |
| iii. 2                              | ... | 57     | 6 &c.           | ... | 87      |
| 1 JOHN.                             |     |        | v. 6 &c.        | ... | 87      |
| ii. 23                              | ... | 151    | vi. 1 &c.       | ... | 87      |
| iii. 1                              | ... | 57     | vii. 11         | ... | 87      |
| v. 7, 8                             | ... | 15, 69 | 14              | ... | 99      |
| 13                                  | ... | 47     | xiii. 1         | ... | 88      |
|                                     |     |        | xiv. 3          | ... | 87      |
|                                     |     |        | 9               | ... | 88      |
|                                     |     |        | xv. 7           | ... | 87      |
|                                     |     |        | xvi. 10         | ... | 139     |
|                                     |     |        | xvii. 8         | ... | 58      |
|                                     |     |        | xix. 4          | ... | 87      |
|                                     |     |        | xxii. 11        | ... | 58      |
|                                     |     |        | 14              | ... | 59      |



# I. K. FUNK & CO.'S RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

*For sale by booksellers, or sent by the publishers, postage prepaid, on receipt of price.*

**Analytical Concordance to the Bible:** On an entirely new plan. By ROBERT YOUNG, LL.D. *Authorized edition, imported.* One large volume, 1090 pages (each page is larger and contains more matter than a page of Webster's Unabridged Dictionary), cloth, \$3.65.

A revised edition of this great work is now ready. Though published but a few months, it has run through a number of editions in Great Britain, and has found an extensive market in America. Its preparation has been the lifetime labor of the painstaking author. The work is designed to lead the simplest reader to a more correct understanding of the common English Bible, *by a reference to the original words in Hebrew and Greek, with their varied shades of meaning*, as explained by the most recent critics. Every word in the English Bible is cast into proper alphabetical order; these are then arranged under their respective original words. To each of these the *literal* meaning is prefixed, and the *pronunciation* appended. About 311,000 references are here found, with all the latest information on Biblical Geography and Antiquities. Says Spurgeon: "Cruden's is child's play compared with this gigantic production."

**Godet's Commentary on St. Luke.** With Preface and Notes by JOHN HALL, D.D. Only American edition. 8vo, cloth, 584 pages, \$2.50.

In the closing words of his introduction, the American editor remarks: "It is with great satisfaction that the present writer wishes God-speed, by this prefatory note, to a volume which is at once learned and reverent, distinct in its exhibition of the positive truth, and vigorously controversial, in which the clearest estimate of the several Gospels is complemented by just views of Him of whose many-sided excellency and glory they are the fourfold presentation." This valuable commentary is meeting with an immense sale in this country. Without exception it is commended by the religious press, and by hundreds of eminent clergymen. The author has long ranked among the foremost of living commentators. His effort in this volume has been crowned with signal success.

**Homiletic Encyclopædia of Illustrations in Theology and Morals:** A Hand-book of Practical Divinity and a Commentary on Holy Scripture. By Rev. R. A. BERTRAM. Royal 8vo, cloth, 892 pages, \$3.75.

"This stupendous volume is well arranged and admirably indexed, so that it may well become useful to even the fullest and ablest preacher. . . . It is a marvellous result of immense and varied reading."—*British Quarterly*.

"This strikes us as being a very valuable compilation, such as might take a lifetime for a man to form for himself. . . . It will

be a golden treasury to those who know how to use it discreetly. The volume is an important addition to the minister's library."—*C. H. Spurgeon, in "Sword and Trowel."*

**"These Sayings of Mine:"** Pulpit Notes on Seven Chapters of the first Gospel. By JOSEPH PARKER, D.D. With an Introduction by Rev. Dr. DEEMS. 8vo, cloth, 320 pages, \$1.50.

**Christian Sociology.** By J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D., Professor in the Theological Department of Wittenberg College. 12mo, cloth, 382 pages, \$1.50.

The minister and the intelligent layman will find the book helpful mentally as well as practically. It is fresh and vigorous, practical rather than speculative, and is rich in suggestive thoughts, and in discussion of timely themes. The book throws new light on many of the burning religious questions of the day, and applies to them the sociological truths of the Gospel. Christian sociology will be found valuable for counteracting infidel tendencies of the day, and for this reason it is worthy of special study.

**Through the Prison to the Throne:** Illustrations of Life from the Biography of Joseph. By Rev. JOSEPH S. VAN DYKE, A.M. 12mo, cloth, 250 pages, \$1.

**Home Altar:** An Appeal in behalf of Family Worship, with Prayers, Hymns, etc., for family use. By CHARLES F. DEEMS, D.D., LL.D. Third edition just issued. 12mo, cloth, 282 pages, 75 cents.

**Preacher's Cabinet:** A Hand-book of Illustrations. By Rev. EDWARD P. THWING. Two volumes, 12mo, paper, 144 pages, 50 cents.

**How to Pay Church Debts.** By Rev. SYLVANUS STALL, A.M. 12mo, cloth, 280 pages, \$1.50.

**How to Enjoy Life.** By WILLIAM M. CORNELL, M.D., LL.D. Fifth edition now ready. 12mo, cloth, 360 pages, \$1.

**Gilead:** An Allegory. By Rev. J. HYATT SMITH, Congressman elect. 12mo, cloth, 360 pages, \$1.

**Standard Hymns:** With Historical Notes of their Authors. Compiled by Rev. EDWARD P. THWING. 32mo, paper, 96 pages, 6 cents. In lots of fifty, each, 5 cents.

---

*The above books are sent, postage free, by the publishers,*

**I. K. FUNK & CO., 10 and 12 Dey Street, New York.**







## Date Due

FACULTY  
FACULTY

5 NOV 17 1994

NOV 17 1994





BS188.R64 c.2  
Companion to the Revised version of the

Pewabic Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00061 6120